

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OR
CRITICAL JOURNAL:

FOR
JANUARY, 1863. . . . APRIL, 1863.

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.

JUDEA DAMNATUR CUM VINCENS ABSOLVITUR.

PUBLIUS SYRUS.

VOL. CXVII.

LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, AND GREEN, LONDON;
AND CHARLES BLACK,
EDINBURGH.

1863.

LONDON

PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

~~OTTERBURN~~ ~~HEATH~~ PUBLIC LIBRARY

vol. No. 7549 Date 23.7.75

CONTENTS OF No. 239.

	Page
ART. I.—1. Minute by the Marquis of Dalhousie, dated Feb. 28, 1856, reviewing his administration in India, from Jan. 1848 to March 1856.	
2. Essays, Military and Political. By Sir H. M. Lawrence, 1859,	1
II.—Aus dem Nachlass Varnhagen's von Ense. Tagebücher von Friedrich von Gentz. Mit einem Vor- und Nach-Worte von Varnhagen von Ense. Leipzig: 1861,	42
III.—1. Papers relating to the present Condition and Prospects of the Goldfields in Victoria. Presented to both Houses of Parliament, April, 1862.	
2. Papers relating to the Discovery of Gold in British Columbia. Presented to both Houses of Parliament, April, 1862.	
3. Geological Observations in South Australia. By the Rev. Julian E. Woods. 8vo. 1862,	82
IV.—1. Original unpublished Papers, illustrative of the Life of Sir Peter Paul Rubens, preserved in Her Majesty's State Paper Office: with an Appendix. Collected and edited by W. Noël Sainsbury, of Her Majesty's State Paper Office. London: 1859.	
2. Lettres inédites de Pierre Paul Rubens, publiées d'après ses Autographes. Par Emile Gachet. Bruxelles: 1840.	
3. Catalogue du Musée d'Anvers. 2nd Edition. Publié par le Conseil d'Administration de l'Académie Royale des Beaux Arts. 1857,	116
V.—1. Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire. Par M. A. Thiers. Tome vingtième. Paris: 1862.	
2. Histoire de la Campagne de 1815. Par Edgar Quinet. Paris: 1862.	
3. Histoire de la Campagne de 1815. Par le Lieutenant-Colonel Charras. Brussels: 1858.	
4. Waterloo: the Downfall of the First Napoleon. By George Hooper. London: 1862,	147
VI.—1. Histoire des Institutions de Moïse et du Peuple hébreu. Par Joseph Salvador. Troisième édition, revue et augmentée d'une introduction sur l'avenir de la question religieuse. Deux tomes. Paris: 1862.	

	Page
2. Jésus-Christ et sa Doctrine. Histoire de la Naissance de l'Eglise, de son Organisation et de ses Progrès pendant le premier Siècle. Par Joseph Salvador. Deux tomes. Paris : 1838.	
3. Histoire de la Domination Romaine en Judée, et de la Ruine de Jérusalem. Par Joseph Salvador. Deux tomes. Paris : 1846.	
4. Paris, Rome, Jérusalem ; ou la Question Religieuse au XIX ^e Siècle. Par Joseph Salvador. Deux tomes. Paris : 1860.	
5. Les Juifs en France, en Italie, et en Espagne. Recherches sur leur Etat depuis leur Dispersion jusqu'à nos Jours, sous le rapport de la Législation, de la Littérature et du Commerce. Par J. Bédaride, Bâtonnier de l'Ordre des Avocats à la Cour Impériale de Montpellier. Paris : 1859.	
6. Jüdisch Mosaischer Religionsunterricht für die Israelitische Jugend. Von Salomon Plessner, Religions-lehrer. Berlin : 5599 (1838).	
7. Gebetbuch für Jüdische Reformgemeinden. Berlin : 1859.	
8. Historical and Critical Commentary on the Old Testament, with a New Translation. — Genesis. By M. M. Kalisch, Ph. D., M.A. London : 1858.	
VII.—Les Misérables. Par Victor Hugo. 10 vols. 8vo. Bruxelles : 1862,	208
VIII.—1. The Prison Chaplain : A Memoir of the Rev. John Clay, B.D., late Chaplain of Preston Gaol ; with selections from his Reports and Correspondence, and a Sketch of Prison Discipline in England. By his Son, the Rev. Walter Lowe Claye, M.A. London : 1861.	
2. Female Life in Prison. By a Prison Matron. Second Edition, in 2 vols. London : 1862.	
3. Observations on the Treatment of Convicts in Ireland ; with some Remarks on the same in England. By Four Visiting Justices of the West Riding Prison at Wakefield. London : 1862.	
4. Report of Committees of both Houses of Parliament on Transportation and Penal Servitude. 1856.	
5. Reports of the Directors of Convict Prisons, England. 1861.	
6. Reports of the Directors of Convict Prisons, Ireland. 1861,	241
IX.—Executive Power. By B. R. Curtis, late Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States. Boston : 1862,	269

CONTENTS OF No. 240.

	Page
ART. I.—The Invasion of the Crimea: its Origin and an Account of its progress down to the Death of Lord Raglan. By Alexander William Kinglake. Vols. I. and II. Edinburgh: 1863,	307
II.—The Odyssey of Homer, translated into English Verse in the Spenserian Stanza. By Philip Stanhope Worsley, M.A., Scholar of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Two vols. Edinburgh and London: 1861-2,	353
III.—1. Report of the Tithe Redemption Trust for the Church in England and Wales for the year 1863.	
2. Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords appointed to inquire into the Deficiency of Means of Spiritual Instruction in the Metropolis, and in other Populous Districts in England and Wales, especially in the Mining and Manufacturing Districts; and to consider the fittest Means of Meeting the Difficulties of the Case. 1858,	360
IV.—Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers, relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain, preserved in the Archives of Simancas and elsewhere. Vol. I. Henry VII. 1485—1509. Edited by G. A. Bergenroth. Published by the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. London: 1862,	378
V.—1. Reports of the Inspectors of Coal Mines to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the year 1860.	
2. Reports of the Inspectors of Mines to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the year 1861.	
3. Report of the Commissioner appointed under the Provisions of the Act 5 & 6 Vict. c. 99. to inquire into the Operations of that Act, and into the State of the Population of the Mining Districts. 1859.	
4. A Voice from the Mines and Furnaces. By the Rev. William Ford Vance, M.A., Incumbent of Cozeley, Staffordshire. Wolverhampton and London: 1853,	406

	Page
VI.—Papers relative to the Mutinies in the East Indies, and Appendices: Sessions 1857–1858,	444
VII.—1. Testimonies to the Divine Authority and Inspiration of the Holy Scripture, as taught by the Church of England. By Dr. M'Caul. London: 1862.	
2. The Inspiration of the Bible. Five Lectures delivered in Westminster Abbey. By Canon Wordsworth. London: 1861.	
3. Inspiration and Interpretation. By Rev. J. W. Burgon. London: 1861.	
4. The Bible and Modern Thought. By Rev. T. R. Birks, M.A. London: 1862.	
5. The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically Examined. By J. W. Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal. Part I. London: 1862. Part II., 1863. .	
6. An Examination of Bishop Colenso's Difficulties. By Dr. M'Caul. London: 1863.	
7. The Historic Character of the Pentateuch Vindicated. A Reply to Part I. of Bishop Colenso's Critical Examination. By a Layman of the Church of England. 8vo. London: 1863,	498
VIII.—1. The Capital of the Tycoon, a Narrative of a Three Years' Residence in Japan. By Sir Rutherford Alcock, K.C.B., Her Majesty's Minister Plenipotentiary in Japan. Two vols. London: 1863.	
2. Correspondence respecting Affairs in Japan. Presented to both Houses of Parliament. February: 1863,	517
IX.—1. Evidence as to Man's Place in Nature. By T. H. Huxley. 8vo. London: 1863.	
2. Osteological Contributions to the Natural History of the Anthropoid Apes." By R. Owen. (Transactions of the Zoological Society of London.) 4to. London: 1840—1863.	
3. Teeth in the Varieties of Man and the Anthropoid Apes. By F. C. Webb. 8vo. London: 1860.	
4. Mémoire sur les Plis Cérébraux de l'Homme et des Primatés. By M. Gratiolet. 4to. Paris: 1854,	541
X. History of the Greek Revolution. By George Finlay, LL.D. Two vols. London: 1861,	570

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
JANUARY, 1863.

No. CCXXXIX.

ART. I. — *Minute by the Marquis of Dalhousie, dated Feb. 28, 1856, reviewing his Administration in India, from Jan. 1848 to March 1856.*

2. *Essays, Military and Political.* By Sir H. M. LAWRENCE, 1859.

THE death, in rapid succession, of the last Governor-General and of the first Viceroy of India closes, with sad completeness, the series of great events and great changes which must always be inseparably connected with their names. Their government constitutes an epoch by itself. Our Indian empire has indeed been, from the first, a very rapid growth. But the two administrations of Dalhousie and Canning have seen a double portion of every difficulty, of every danger, and of every triumph, which, during the previous century, had tried and confirmed our rule. We propose in this, and in a succeeding article, to review the course of those fourteen memorable years, and to estimate the results which they have bequeathed to us and to future times. It ought, now, to be possible to do this with a near approach to truth. A whole age seems already to have passed since the Sutlej was the boundary of British India, since the Sepoy was its main defence, and since its Government was still 'The Company.' And then—one great source of error exists no longer. The personal antagonism which never fails to affect, more or less, the judgment of contemporaries on the conduct of living statesmen, is not generally an antagonism which survives the grave; and as regards these two men—so different, yet both so remarkable—who, during that time,

represented the name and fame of England in the East, we can measure very fairly, if we choose to do so, the various merits of their policy, and the different directions of their success.

Lord Dalhousie landed in India early in January 1848. He was a civilian, with no other official experience than such as had been acquired at the Board of Trade. He came to take the command of a great military empire out of the hands of a soldier, who was the comrade and the friend of Wellington, and who, in the tremendous battles of the Sutlej, had found enough to task to the utmost even his knowledge and resource in war. But the universal expectation then was, that Lord Dalhousie's reign would be a reign of peace. Strange as this expectation must appear to us, who know what followed, it was, perhaps, not unnatural at the time. At Ferozeshah, the fate of India had trembled in the balance; and even now it is hardly possible to read, without holding our breath, the account of those hours of night, when, after a bloody and doubtful contest, Hardinge and Gough went round by turns their few and decimated battalions, telling them that, at break of day, the bayonet must decide their fate. But that morning charge had been so well delivered, followed by the victory of Aliwal, and the 'crowning mercy' of Sohraon, that England believed the Khalsa army to be broken and destroyed, and the empire of Runjeet Singh to have passed conclusively into the number of dependent states. Yet barely three months had passed from Lord Dalhousie's landing in the Hooghley, when the murder of Anderson and Agnew, at Mooltan, gave token of all that commonly follows such murders in the East. Then came a long series of those deeds of which the history of British India is so full, and of which no other history can produce the like. Single officers — at distant stations, alone, unsupported, in the midst of waverers, and fanatics, and traitors — by courage, and command, and indomitable determination, and infinite address, kept at bay, for many months, with mere handfuls of men, all the various armies of Singhs, and Sirdars, and Ameers, and Khans. But in spite of Edwardes, and Cortland, and Herbert, and Lawrence, the tide of rebellion swelled, till, at Chillianwalla, it broke with a vengeance on the army of Lord Gough. Such was the greeting which awaited the new Governor-General, when on the first anniversary after his arrival in India, he reached the scene of action on the frontier. After a bloody action, characterised by circumstances of extreme danger, and of some discredit, the British army had enough to do to maintain itself on the field of battle. Salvos from the enemy's artillery gave vent to an

Palmerston, and at that time included Lord Canning, who had already been designated as Lord Dalhousie's successor. It is a question, therefore, which, unlike most questions of Indian Administration, received the deliberate consideration of the Queen's Government, and the decision of which, more directly than others, rested on their final responsibility. The result was a despatch from the Court of Directors, leaving it to the Governor-General to be guided by circumstances as to the mode of securing the desired result, but indicating strongly an opinion that the proposal of withdrawing our troops from Oude was one founded on too limited an interpretation of our rights, and one which, regarded as an indirect measure of compulsion, might involve the risk of failure. The authority of the Court was, therefore, given to Lord Dalhousie, 'to assume authoritatively the powers necessary for good government throughout the country,' in any form in which he might find it best that this assumption should be effected. On the morning after this despatch was received a special Council was summoned by Lord Dalhousie, and an unanimous decision was arrived at on the course to be pursued. In this decision several members of the Council yielded something, but the Governor-General yielded most. 'I resolved,' he says, 'to forego my own preferences, and in dealing with Oude to adopt the more peremptory course which had been advocated by my colleagues, and which was manifestly more acceptable to the Honourable Company.' Without prolonging controversy on points of principle, but protesting against the doctrine laid down by Mr. Grant, he yet agreed to a course which was logically defensible on no other principle than that which Mr. Grant maintained. The consent of the King of Oude was to be asked to a new treaty; but it was to be asked with notice, that if he did not consent, the only difference would be that he himself would lose all security for the name and pension which otherwise would be guaranteed. The position offered to the king was the position which Sleeman, and Lawrence, and Outram had indicated as the only position he had any right to keep. He was to be told that we had determined to assume the government of his country; that if he would give his consent he should be guaranteed in the hereditary title and in an ample hereditary revenue; but that if he did not consent, both his position and his income must rest with the Governor-General and Council for the time being. This was very much a repetition of Lord Wellesley's course in 1800-1. But it is needless to say that it was consistent with no principle applicable to independent States; and the attempt to avoid the appearance of force, or the

MS. A. 10. 7549 Date 23.7.75

MS. A. 10.

7549

Date

23.7.75

avowal of a right which we were, nevertheless asserting, proved as fruitless as, in our opinion, it was needless. The king of Oude behaved with a dignity which even the most degraded Orientals are not unfrequently able to command in the supreme moments of life. He resolutely refused to sign the instrument of his own humiliation. Persuasion, threats, and remonstrance were all in vain. 'Uncovering himself, he placed his turban in the hands of Outram, declaring that now his titles, rank, and position were all gone, it was not for him to sign a treaty, or to enter into any negotiation. He was in the hands of the British Government which had seated Her Majesty's grandfather on the throne, and could at its pleasure consign him to obscurity.' Yet, the Resident retired, we are told, from the royal presence 'with the usual ceremonies and honours' paid to an Indian sovereign. On the third day after this scene--being the day fixed as a limit by the instructions of the Resident, the proclamation went forth by which it was announced 'that the Government of the territories of Oude is henceforth vested exclusively and for ever in the Honourable East India Company.'

The alleged connexion of this measure with subsequent events will come under our review hereafter. Meanwhile, it is enough to say that the annexation of Oude, whether as regards its time, its substance, or its form, was less due to any special policy pursued by Lord Dalhousie than perhaps any other act of his administration.

Nor need we dwell, in connexion with our subject, upon the conquest and retention of the province of Pegue. This was the result of a war with a foreign Power. The whole preparation of the expeditionary force was managed by Lord Dalhousie. It was admirably done, and the war carried to a rapid and triumphant issue. Just as in the Burmese war of 1826, we had conquered and retained the provinces of Tenasserim, Arracan, and Assam, so in the war forced on the Indian Government in 1848-9 by the arrogance and obstinacy of the Burmese Court, we conquered and retained the province of Pegue. It was peopled with a race which was friendly to us; it intervened between possessions already ours; and it gave us for the future complete command, whether for the purposes of war or commerce, over the great river mouths of Burmah. But the circumstances of that conquest have no bearing on our policy towards the native states of Hindostan. Lord Dalhousie's government of this province has been hardly less successful than his government of the Punjaub. So far as we have yet seen, it is an acquisition which is easily kept, and is well worth keeping;

though, like every other of the same kind, it was forced upon us by events which were neither foreseen nor desired.

There is yet one other case which involved no disputed question. 'The kingdom of Nagpore,' said Lord Dalhousie, 'became British territory by simple lapse, in the absence of all legal heirs. The kingdom which had been granted to the reigning Rajah by the British Government was left without a claimant when the Rajah died. No son had been born to His Highness; none had been adopted by him: none was adopted by the Ranees, his widows. The British Government refused to bestow the territory in free gift upon a stranger, and wisely incorporated it with its own dominions.'

Of all the great acquisitions of territory, then, which happened during Lord Dalhousie's Government, his supposed policy of annexation must rest upon the opinion he expressed, and the advice he gave on the comparatively small principalities of Sattarah and of Jhansie. Sattarah was a principality which we had ourselves created. The family which we placed upon its throne was indeed an old one. It represented the great Hindoo chief who in the seventeenth century had founded the Mahratta kingdom of the Deccan. But by the time we came into contact with that formidable race, the family of SEVAJEE had shared the usual fate of Eastern royalty. Its dominions had passed into the hands of usurpers, and nothing remained to it but lodgings in a prison, and the shadow of an illustrious name. When the British army under Sir John Malcolm in the Mahratta war of 1818 defeated the Peishwah, captured his person, and annexed his country to the dominions of the Company, it was deemed expedient to bestow a small part of that territory, 'sufficient for the maintenance of his family in comfort and dignity,' upon the hereditary puppet whom Bajee Rao had kept in prison. This was done in the usual form of a 'treaty.' This rajah having violated the conditions imposed upon him, was deposed in 1839, and his next brother placed upon the throne. The new rajah had no family of his own; and this fact, as well as the improbability of his having any, had been specially referred to by the Governor of Bombay, as holding out the prospect of the lapse of the principality to the Government of India, 'unless it should be thought expedient to allow the line of princes to be continued by the Hindoo custom of adoption — a question which should be left entirely open for consideration when the event occurs.' Aware of this, the rajah, in declining health, applied to the British Government for its sanction to the continuance of his 'Raj,' through an adopted son. No answer had been received to this request when the pro-

gress of disease warned the rajah that he must act on the chance of a favourable reply. In the last hours of life, and almost in the agonies of death, the first child that could be found at hand available for the purpose, was brought to the dying rajah, and formally adopted according to Hindoo rites. Was this act to be recognised as conveying the principality? Sir George Clerk, who was then Governor of Bombay, alone of all the authorities in India, was in favour of allowing the succession of the child. He admitted that the adoption required our sanction. He admitted that no uniform rule of practice required us to give it. But he held that the 'treaty' securing the principality to 'heirs and successors,' included heirs by adoption as well as heirs by birth. The rajah had never himself advanced this claim. On the contrary, he had himself pleaded the necessity of British sanction against an adopted child of his own brother. But if Sir George Clerk's opinion were well founded, it was needless to argue on grounds of policy. He recorded it, however, as his opinion that, 'unquestionably a native government, conducted 'as that of Sattarah has lately been, is a source of strength to 'the British Government.'

In these views the Governor of Bombay could not carry his Council with him. On the first point, which was the main one, his arguments were conclusively answered in an able paper by Mr. Willoughby. The new Governor who succeeded when the question was still pending — Lord Falkland — adopted, after full consideration, the opinion of the Council; and the Governor-General, in a Minute marked by all his vigour and ability, gave his voice against the continuance of the principality, both on the ground of right and on the ground of policy. The Court of Directors, by a large majority representing the weight of opinion not less than the weight of numbers, adopted the view of the Governor-General:—

'We are fully satisfied that by the general law and custom of India, a dependent principality, like that of Sattarah, cannot pass to an adopted heir without the consent of the paramount Power; that we are under no pledge, direct or constructive, to give such consent; and that the general interests committed to our charge are best consulted by withholding it.'

Jhansie was a smaller case, involving the same principle, and decided in the same sense. It was in the discussion of the Sattarah question that Lord Dalhousie recorded his dissent from the doctrine, apparently implied by Sir George Clerk, — that the maintenance of native governments in the midst of our own dominions was in itself an advantage:—

'There may be conflict of opinion,' he says, 'as to the advantage

or propriety of extending our already vast possessions beyond their present limits. No man can deprecate more than I do any extension of the frontiers of our territory which can be avoided, or which may not become indispensably necessary for considerations of our own safety and of the maintenance of the tranquillity of our own provinces. But I cannot conceive it possible for any one to dispute the policy of taking advantage of every just opportunity which presents itself for consolidating the territories which already belong to us, by taking possession of states which may lapse in the midst of them; for thus getting rid of those petty intervening principalities which may be made a means of annoyance, but which can never, I venture to think, be a source of strength; for adding to the resources of the public treasury; and for extending the uniform application of our system of government to those whose best interests, we sincerely believe, will be promoted thereby. . . . The Government is bound, in duty as well as in policy, to act on every such occasion with the purest integrity and in the most scrupulous good faith. When even a shadow of doubt can be shown, the claim should be at once abandoned.'

This is the nearest approach which we can find in any of Lord Dalhousie's writings to the advocacy of a policy of annexation. But in the general principle here announced, there was nothing new. This principle, and no other, had governed the action of the Indian Government in every previous case — and there had been many — in which the failure of natural heirs had been made the occasion of appropriating petty states, principalities, or jaghires. It had been explicitly laid down in very similar terms by the Court of Directors nearly twenty years before. But the truth is, that under all the reservations with which it has been usually expressed, and with which it is specially guarded by Lord Dalhousie, it leaves room, after all, for every degree of doubt in respect to its application to individual cases. Accordingly, every instance in which native territory has been absorbed within British dominion in India, must be judged on its own merits. But it is important to observe that the general principle thus laid down by Lord Dalhousie has exclusive reference to native sovereignties, and has no adverse bearing on the policy of maintaining a native aristocracy. The right to convey by adoption all private rights and private property was not called in question in the case of Sattarah, but was, on the contrary, declared and admitted. Wherever a native aristocracy exists, or can be created, founded on possessions or position short of sovereignty, it may be perpetuated by adoption, without contravening the principle laid down by Lord Dalhousie. There is an immense variety in the feudal tenures of India. Some of them are very bad; others it may be expedient to preserve. But as

regards native governments he had seen enough to know that their vices were systematic and their virtues casual. He knew that the virtual dependence to which they are reduced by our power in India did not tend to make them better. Sir Henry Lawrence, who knew them well, has said of them, 'If they cannot plunder strangers, they must harry their own people. The rule holds good throughout India. The instances among native states where the cultivator is certain of reaping what he has sown, and of being called on to pay only what has been previously agreed, are most rare.' No severer condemnation of native states has ever been pronounced. Lord Dalhousie could not doubt that a rule of succession, which would increase the chance of long minorities, must double every evil and intensify every source of corruption to which such governments are exposed.

By the various territorial additions which we have thus reviewed, the frontiers of British India were carried to the line at which they still remain, and at which, in all human probability, they will continue to remain for many years to come.

Much as these questions of war and policy occupied Lord Dalhousie's time, the eight years of his administration were marked by events even more important than conquests and annexations. No man who has represented our rule in India had ever prosecuted with so much vigour the works of peace. In England the great public undertakings on which the progress of society and the increase of wealth depend, are the fruit of private enterprise. In India they have hitherto rested almost exclusively with the Government. Everything, therefore, has depended on the estimate placed by the Government on their value and importance. Nothing but a very strong conviction could overcome the difficulties with which every Governor-General was beset. The cost of unexpected, but almost continual wars, added to the cost of administration over so vast an empire, had left the Indian Treasury in a state of chronic deficiency. But Lord Dalhousie knew, and acted on the conviction, that the only hope of restoring the balance must come from increased expenditure of a better and more profitable kind. 'The ordinary revenues of the Indian Empire,' he observes, 'are amply sufficient, and more than sufficient, to meet its ordinary charges; but they are not sufficient to provide for the innumerable gigantic works which are necessary to its due improvement. It is impracticable to effect, and absurd to attempt, the material improvement of a great empire by an expenditure which shall not exceed the limits of its ordinary annual income.' Acting on this principle,

Lord Dalhousie took a personal and eager part in the prosecution of public works. The charges on account of public works rose in his time to the unprecedented sum of two million and a half for one year;—and to very nearly three million (sterling) in another. In the Punjab, large sums were at once set apart for the purpose, and great lines of road surveyed and undertaken under the superintendence of the incomparable Lieutenants to whom the administration of that province had been intrusted. In the same province, and under the same agency, the Barge Doab Canal was designed and vigorously prosecuted. The entire length of this canal, with its branches, will be 450 miles. The thirsty lands, through which its waters were to be led, were personally inspected by Lord Dalhousie; and he wrote with enthusiasm to the Court of Directors of the benefits which would be conferred upon the people. In the North-western provinces the great work of the Ganges Canal was pushed forward with vigour until, in 1854, its main stream was opened for the double purpose of navigation and of irrigation. No financial pressure, no exigencies of war, were suffered to interrupt its progress. Of the magnitude of this work some idea may be formed when we are told that it extends 525 miles in length; that for purposes of irrigation it is fivefold longer than all the main irrigation lines of Lombardy united; that, as regards navigation, it nearly equals the aggregate length of the four greatest navigable canals in France; that it greatly exceeds all the first-class canals in Holland put together, and that it is greater, by nearly one third, than the greatest navigation canal of the United States of America.

The electric telegraph was rapidly spread over the whole of India. Within fifteen months it was in operation from Calcutta to Agra, thence to Attock on the Indus, and again from Agra to Bombay and Madras. These lines extended over 3000 miles. To Lord Dalhousie the people of India owe the establishment in their country of the system of cheap and uniform postage—that boon of inestimable value which has placed the name of Rowland Hill very high among the benefactors of mankind. No happier idea has ever been conceived; none has been worked out in practice with more admirable skill, or received such triumphant recognition in every civilised country of the world. Distance, however great, seems to have no effect on its applicability and success. In India a single letter is conveyed from Peshawur, on the borders of Affghanistan, to the southernmost village of Cape Comorin, or from Delrooghur, in Upper Assam, to Kurrachee, at the mouth of the Indus, for a charge of three farthings. Last, not least, Lord Dal-

housie, in 1853, submitted to the Home Government his views on the general question of railways in India. His advice was that their formation should be encouraged to the utmost. The Court of Directors were urged not to hesitate to engage in the enterprise upon a scale commensurate to the vast extent of the territories which had been placed under their government, and to the great political and commercial interests which were involved. They were urged to do this, not directly by undertaking the work themselves, but by affording such help — by guarantee or otherwise — as might suffice to attract to India the commercial capital and enterprise of England. This he dwelt upon as an object to be aimed at, apart from and besides all other benefits to be derived from the operation of railways in India. The Government of India had — and would always continue to have — public works of another kind on hand, more than sufficient to occupy all the resources at its command. But even if it had not, it should aim, above all things, at the establishment in India of the same spirit of private enterprise on which had been mainly founded the improvement and civilisation of the Western world.

‘One of the greatest drawbacks,’ wrote Lord Dalhousie to the Directors, ‘to the advance of this country in material prosperity, has been the total dependence upon the Government in which the community has placed itself, and its apparent helplessness to do anything for itself. Until very recently the only regular carrier in the country has been the Government, and no man could make a journey but with the Government establishments, or by the agency of a Government officer. It was but the other day that the agent of Lloyd’s, in the Port of Moultmein, where there is a considerable community of European merchants, formally complained that the Government of India did not keep a steamtug, to tow their ships to sea for them. Even in those instances in which something like enterprise has been attempted, by means of joint-stock companies, the effect has been feeble — the results insignificant. For years the steam companies on the Ganges have complained of the competition of Government steamers. During the last year fully one half of the Government steamers has been withdrawn; nevertheless one of the two steam companies has ceased to run. It is so in everything else — no one seems to have activity enough, in connexion with a company even to look after his own interests. I submit that any time and money which the Honourable Court could save by undertaking such works itself, would be well expended in securing the introduction, at this time, of a large amount of English capital and English energy, so as to encourage, by the successful issue which I anticipate for these railway undertakings, a more extensive employment of similar capital and similar efforts hereafter in connexion with the products and trade of India.’

But Lord Dalhousie contended for another principle, upon which, as is well known, he had been foiled in England. He contended that the Government should retain such control over the execution of the works as should secure a due application of the capital expended, and should render impossible the wastefulness and jobbery which had been the ruin of so many companies at home. The course which has since been actually adopted is to guarantee a minimum rate of interest on the capital advanced by English companies for the construction of railways in India. One evil of this system is that it tends to prevent any rigid economy in the construction of the works; and it may be questioned whether the Government agency of inspection is sufficient to check extravagant expenditure. Yet without a guarantee it is probable that the requisite capital would not have been forthcoming at all; and although that guarantee of five per cent. is now in operation on a total expenditure of some 43,000,000*l.*, causing, for a time, a heavy drain on the revenues of the empire, the vast benefits, direct and indirect, which result to the Government are becoming every day more fruitful and more secure.

The sixth year of Lord Dalhousie's rule ended the lease under which, so often renewed, the 'Company' still held the nominal Government of India. Consequently, that curious and complicated system which had arisen from the great parliamentary contest of 1783-4 came once more to be reconsidered. It is remarkable how little the changes made by the Act of 1854, or the much greater changes which have been effected since, have altered the essential features of the plan struck out by the genius of Pitt. It can never be too distinctly repeated, because it appears to be very little understood, that the government he established was the government of the Crown. The purpose for which the Company was maintained was not to limit Parliament or the Crown in matters of government, but to keep their hands off in matters of commerce and of patronage. Pitt always avowed that his bill was intended to make the Crown supreme in every question of policy and of government. It was not for doing this that he had denounced the bill of Mr. Fox, and roused against it the jealous indignation of the English people. Fox's bill did, indeed, propose to do the same, but it had proposed also to do a great deal more. The 'Company' was then a commercial body, holding in monopoly a gigantic trade, possessing from that trade an enormous revenue, and having in its pay a staff of servants proportioned in number and in influence to the imperial magnitude of its concerns. All this, without distinction or differ-

ence between what belonged to commerce and what belonged to Government, was equally placed by Fox's bill under the control and management of a body nominated by the Crown. There would not have been a supercargo whom they could not appoint, nor a clerk whom they could not dismiss. There would have been no restraint on the extent or character of their patronage. A special clause exempted them from even recording their reasons for appointing strangers to any office in the service of the Company. The proprietors of the Company were to receive from a branch of the Executive their knowledge of their own 'debts and credits;' of the 'first cost and charges of' 'their investments outwards and inwards — of their shipping' 'accounts — of the produce of their sales, and of the state of' 'their warehouses at home and abroad.'* All this would seem to have been much forgotten. Even such men as Mill the historian have misconceived and misrepresented the essential point on which that great contest turned. Pitt, we are often told, when he came into power, did exactly that for which he had censured Fox, inasmuch as by his invention of the Board of Control he subjected completely the Government of India to the Ministers of the Crown. He did so; and he repeated over and over again that he meant to do so. The Indian empire was the empire of the British Sovereign, and its Government and administration must be subject to the supreme executive and supreme legislature of the State. But within the sphere of patronage and of commerce, the independence of the Company was as jealously guarded by Mr. Pitt as the supremacy of the Crown within the sphere of politics. The only exception to the power of the Crown in political affairs had reference to the danger of pecuniary corruption, and it is curious that this exception has been maintained to the present day. The Board of Control could impose no new charge on the revenues of India. But with this exception the Court of Directors became, as regarded the Government of India, nothing more than the councillors of the Minister who presided in Cannon Row. They might be his trusted councillors; they might be left to pursue their own traditions; but they might also be thwarted at every turn, and instructions put into their mouth which they never saw, or which, if they did see, they disapproved. Thenceforward the 'Company' were no longer except in name the governors of India. At home, through the Board of Control always, and through the Secret Committee on special occasions,—in India, through the Governor-General, who

* Mr. Fox's bill, clause 14.

was almost always an English statesman, and was practically nominated by the Minister of the day, the Government of India was the Government of the Crown. It is a signal instance of the power of mere names and of legal fictions, that in spite of these unquestionable facts, the Company has been accustomed to claim all the merit, and its opponents have been accustomed to charge against it all the faults, of the Government of India. We are bound to say that on the whole the accusations have been more idle than the boasts. The servants of the Company have formed a school of administrators in whom the Crown has been wont, and did well, to trust. But in so far as the Government of India has been in this sense really the government of the Company, their power and influence has been founded on superior knowledge, or on traditions which received the assent and approbation of the Ministers of the Crown.

But the power which resulted from special knowledge and special aptitude resided far more in the officers of the Company who were the actual administrators in India, than in the Directors who were the nominal governors at home. It was, however, a real power, and it assisted in maintaining the position of the Company when some of the original supports of that position had begun to fail. In proportion as the mercantile character of the Company declined, their character as Governors emerged in prominence and importance. At the end of their lease, which expired in 1813, they were deprived of their monopoly in the trade to India. At the end of the next twenty years, they were deprived also of the remaining monopoly in the trade to China. Each of these measures was contested, and the contest on the question of commerce served to postpone any farther contest as to the question of their position in the Government of India. For the first time in 1853, the political question arose unembarrassed by any contest respecting commerce. But there still remained one of the two great reasons on account of which such value had been placed on the political position of the Company as an intermediate body between the Crown and the Government of India. Their commerce was gone; their fleets of noble Indiamen no longer brought home to England the teas and the silks of China. But their patronage still remained. Every office in those great civil and military services by which an empire had been conquered and through which it continued to be administered,—from the councillors, whose salaries were double that of the Prime Minister of England, to the magistrates and collectors who ruled over territories which had been kingdoms,—every com-

mission in an army which exceeded the English army in numbers and rivalled it in discipline, renown, and in feats of arms,—was still at the disposal of the Directors of the East India Company. Through what other channel this vast patronage could be safely dispensed remained as difficult a problem as in the days of Pitt. Other difficulties, which were purely imaginary, in the way of transferring to the Crown the nominal as well as the real government of India, had grown up out of confusion of thought and ignorance of facts. It had been sedulously taught and sincerely believed that the Company was a screen indispensable to veil the Government of India from the action of party in the English Parliament. The truth is, it had never served this purpose, and it never could. On every occasion on which Indian questions had assumed any important bearing on politics at home, they had been warmly contested in the House of Commons. On one memorable occasion, they had determined the policy of England and changed the fate of Europe. Ever since that period, Parliament had known perfectly well that the Ministers of the Crown were responsible for the Government of India. It did not often interfere with their discretion, because it had little knowledge of Indian affairs, and because those affairs had generally no connexion with the questions of engrossing interest at home. The comparative immunity of Indian politics from the influence of party contests arose, not from a legal fiction with which all the leaders of party were perfectly familiar, but from the nature of things—from facts which could not be affected, one way or another, by a mere change of name.

But if the Company had come to be credited with benefits which did not really flow from it, on the other hand there was nothing to show that the part which the Constitution did assign to it, had been otherwise than well performed. The Directors of the Company were the councillors of the Crown in its government of India. No council newly constituted would have the same weight, or represent the same traditions. The erroneous notions which had arisen respecting the benefits of its action were at least a proof of the reputation it had acquired in this, which was its true capacity. Accordingly, the Government of Lord Aberdeen, when called upon to deal with this great question, maintained the Company in its old political position; yet they made some changes, which, though now almost forgotten, were really changes of great significance. The Company were continued as Trustees for the Government of India; but they were no longer conti-

nued for a fixed term of years. There were no commercial interests requiring the security which such a tenure had been originally intended to afford. There was no longer any reason why Parliament should not be free at any time either to do without a Council, or to change its form and constitution. Still farther to mark the Court of Directors as nothing but a Council, its number was reduced by one fourth, and of the remaining number—18 instead of 24—one third was for the first time to be nominated by the Crown. These were great changes, and all tending in one direction. But the greatest change of all effected in the Act of 1854 was that which attacked the real difficulty, on account of which the Company had been so long maintained in its political position. Its patronage of the Civil Service was taken from it, and yet that patronage was not given to the Crown. Whether the scheme of recruiting for the Civil Service by free competition will succeed in maintaining or improving the Civil Service of India, it was at least a method of escaping from the alternative which had always been contemplated with such alarm. It was a step, and a long one, towards the greater change which was so soon to follow. The one great difficulty which still remained was the patronage of the army and the union of the two armies—a difficulty which tradition had exaggerated, but which the Cabinet of Lord Aberdeen did not feel itself under any strong necessity to face; and if it had not been for this, there is reason to believe that the measure, which was at last precipitated by the great mutiny of 1857, would have been proposed to Parliament in 1854, on grounds more sound, though perhaps not so popular, as those which ultimately prevailed.

There was another change made by the Act of 1854 which had respect to the constitution of the Government in India. This was an enlargement of the Supreme Council, so as to include representatives of the minor presidencies and some of the judges of the Supreme Court. But since in this, as well as in other matters, the provisions of the Act of 1854 have proved to be of short duration, we shall defer, to our review of Lord Canning's Government, a full consideration of the important questions involved in the history and constitution of that body.

Looking back as we now do upon the years of Lord Dalhousie's rule, through the light of subsequent events, we naturally search for anything in the transactions of the time which can have had any bearing on the condition of the native army. But in all that respects its organisation and its discipline the character of that great force had been determined long before.

It cannot be said that during those years any new influence was brought to bear upon it. The fidelity of that army in the field had been never doubted, and at no period of our Indian history had that fidelity been more severely tried. It has been supposed that the disasters of the Affghan war shook our credit with the native Powers; but there is no reason to suppose that it can have shaken our credit with the native army. The Sepoy bore his full share of our defeat, and his full share, also, in the triumphs by which it was redeemed. In the battles of the Sutlej he was as brave and as faithful as in the days of Clive. Perhaps our dependence upon that fidelity was sometimes only too apparent. For it must always be remembered that the fidelity of the native soldier to his European master is based upon the allegiance which is due from the inferior to the superior mind — from ignorance to knowledge — from weakness to power. Every symptom of weakness, every instance of mismanagement in the English officer, tends to shake the confidence of the Sepoy; and even a moment's doubt on the issue of a contest, such as that which troubled all England and all India, at Ferozeshah and Chillianwallah, tends in some degree to shake the pillars of our rule. Still, our victory was at last complete. It was the victory of the Sepoy also; and if the consciousness of his own value was increased, this feeling was most fortunately exhibited rather in arrogance towards the Sikhs than in disaffection to ourselves.

But in looking back to the influences affecting the condition of the native army, there is one not to be forgotten, and that is, its mere growth in numbers. The great wars in which we had been so frequently engaged, and the conquests of new territory which had been their almost invariable result, had tended steadily to increase the levies by which alone so vast an empire could be held. Before the Affghan war in 1838 the total native force was under 154,000 men. Before the outbreak of the first Sikh war, in 1845, it stood at 240,310. Under the pressure of that war the native army was materially augmented by Lord Hardinge. At the end of that campaign it was to some extent reduced, and when the second Sikh war arose in the time of his successor, it was thought that this reduction had been dangerous and premature. Towards the close of Lord Dalhousie's rule, when all his wars were over, and when the risk at least of internal danger had been reduced to a minimum, the native army amounted to upwards of 233,000 men. This includes the contingents of native princes, which were officered by Englishmen, but does not include the independent levies which those princes maintained for their own

purposes. If this vast force had been ever regarded in connexion with even the possibility of a contest of race against race, it would have seemed, and it would have been, a danger compared with which all others were insignificant. But no such thought ever entered into the head of Indian statesmen, or of Indian soldiers. They knew that without the native army our empire never could have been acquired, and they knew, too, that without it that empire could not be maintained for a single year. To doubt its fidelity would have been to doubt our own powers of rule. First and foremost among these, the very type and symbol of all the rest, is the power of subduing the native races to our will, and yoking them to our military service. When that power is lost, the Indian sceptre will have departed from us. It is not surprising, therefore, that we look in vain for any symptom of a fear which would have gone so deep and implied so much.

There had been, indeed, in the course of our Indian history, mutinies in the native army; but they had been almost always of a local and partial nature — from some one or other of the many causes of discontent which are at times unavoidable in dealing with bodies of armed men. On one occasion, and on one occasion only in the history of India, there had been a mutiny, which, as we look back upon it now, seems to have foreshadowed the terrible events of 1857. Two regiments of the Madras army rose in the dead of night on their European comrades. There had been no warning, and there was no suspicion. The English and the native soldier had been engaged together, not long before, in one of the bloodiest of our Indian wars. They occupied together the conquered country, formed part of the same garrison, and mounted guard on the same ramparts. Suddenly there burst forth on the part of the dark race all the symptoms of inextinguishable hate. Every European that could be found defenceless was murdered in cold blood with true Asiatic treachery. The excuse for this foul deed had been offence on account of some military regulation about the shape of a turban, and the cut of a beard. The alarm in India, at the time, was great, but it was of short duration. Regiments of the same native army were led without fear against the mutineers. They were overpowered; and the guilty regiments were erased for ever from an army whose standards had been always carried with proud fidelity from the days of Arcot until then. This was indeed a memorable event; and the historians of British India have ever since narrated with horror the mutiny and massacre of Vellore. But half a century had passed, not only unmarked by one repetition of such deeds, but

full of testimony to the courage and faithfulness of the native army.

One occasion of partial discontent arose during Lord Dalhousie's rule, and led incidentally to that misunderstanding between the Governor-General and the Commander-in-Chief, which ended in Sir Charles Napier's resignation. The native regiments serving in the Punjaub, before it was finally annexed, had enjoyed the additional pay allowed to troops serving beyond the frontier. When the Punjaub became a British province, they were reduced to the same pay as that received by their comrades in other parts of the Indian territory. The mutinous spirit evinced by some corps on this reduction was, however, speedily suppressed by the vigorous and prudent measures taken by Sir Charles Napier and Sir Colin Campbell. At another period, under the impression, as he says, that the temper of the army was in a critical state, arising out of this question, Sir Charles Napier issued, of his own authority, an order respecting military allowances, which incurred the censure of the Governor-General in Council. It is not our purpose here to enter into the personal part of that misunderstanding on which the decision of the late Duke of Wellington, adverse to the conduct of Sir Charles Napier, may well be accepted as conclusive. It is important to observe, however, that in defending his own course, Napier was naturally disposed to make the most of the danger with which he had been called to deal. Accordingly, in the preface of his work '*Indian Misgovernment*,' we find it broadly stated, '*Mutiny with the Sepoys is the most formidable danger menacing our Indian empire.*' But mutiny, such as he had then in view—discontent on questions of pay or allowances—is a very different thing from disaffection founded on religious fanaticism and antipathy of race. The same work shows, not only how little this danger was present to Sir Charles Napier's mind, but how eager he was in proposals which may be taken as the most decisive of all tests of his habitual confidence in the native army. If the magnitude of our empire was a source of danger in augmenting too largely the native force, it had involved at least one counterbalancing effect of immense advantage. Large as the native army was, it had plenty of work to do. The imperfect organisation with which we administered such vast dominions, resulting from the random manner in which they were acquired, had cast upon the Indian army an infinite variety of duties which dispersed it into a thousand fragments. Except on the frontiers which were most exposed to attack from without, there was no concentration of native regiments, and even then the extent of frontier often interposed

a very long march between the separate corps. To military men who looked to the efficiency of that army for the purposes of war, this was a perpetual subject of complaint. And beyond all doubt, if the danger to be most sedulously guarded against was an external danger, those complaints were just. But if the army itself contained the elements of a formidable danger, the full occupation of its activity in time of peace, and its wide dispersion, was not an evil but a good. Sir Charles Napier not only had no such danger present to his mind, but scouted it as unworthy of a moment's thought. In the celebrated memoir on the military defence of India which he gave in to Lord Dalhousie, in November 1849, we find the following curious and instructive passage:—

‘The most important point next to the location of our troops is now to be considered, *viz.*, the immense enhancement of military discipline, and the perfection at which large masses of troops arrive by being collected in numbers. . . . *All the moral feelings* of an army and its physical powers are increased by being assembled in large masses. It was said Lord Hardinge objected to assembling the Indian troops for fear they should conspire. This reason I cannot accede to, and have never met an Indian officer who did accede to it; and few men have had more opportunities of judging the armies of all three presidencies than myself. Lord Hardinge only saw the Bengal army, as Governor-General, and for a short time. I have constantly commanded and studied Bengal and Bombay Sepoys for nearly eight years, and could find nothing to fear from them except when ill-used; and even then they are less dangerous than British troops would be in similar circumstances. There is, it seems to me, no danger in their being massed, but very great danger in their being spread over a country as they are now. By concentrating the Indian army, its spirit, its devotion, and its powers will all be increased. By dispersion, our safety hangs on the want of combination between two or more of our surrounding enemies, and such a combination is so far from being improbable, that its not yet having taken place is almost miraculous.’

This passage is decisive on the confidence placed by Sir Charles Napier in the native army, and especially on the absence of any idea in his mind that risk could arise out of the antagonism of religion and of race. It is the more remarkable, as we have reason to know that the reference made to the opinion of Lord Hardinge is a correct one, and that he had expressed, in the strongest terms, his sense of the danger which might arise from the native army being massed together. With rare sagacity, he had read in the events of the Sikh war a lesson on this matter which others had failed to see. It was the Khalsa army, not the Lahore Government, which

began the Sikh war. The great force which Runjeet had brought together, and had disciplined with admirable efficiency for the purposes of war, was an army whose fierce fanaticism, inflamed by concentration and by the sense of power, had become incapable of control. Lord Hardinge alone, so far as we know, of all those who have been connected with the Government of India, had present to his mind the notion that a similar danger might arise in our own army, and on that ground was opposed to measures which have been often warmly recommended by military men, and were undoubtedly desirable in a purely military point of view.

It must be remembered, however, that the step recommended by Sir Charles Napier was not actually taken; and it is only as testing the state of opinion in India on this subject that the proposal has any interest now. The question, therefore, still remains whether anything was actually done, as to the organisation of the army, during the period of Lord Dalhousie's Government, which can have had any influence — for the better or for the worse — on subsequent events. There were two steps taken — one of which, so far as it went, was adverse, and the other of which was highly favourable. The measure which was of adverse influence was an increase of the rank and file of the Sepoy regiments from 800 to 1000 men; the measure which was of favourable effect was the encouragement and more extended employment of irregular and local corps. As regards the first of these, it was a step taken at the urgent solicitation of Sir Charles Napier, after the second Sikh war; and before Lord Dalhousie left India he left on record his opinion that the Sepoy regiment ought to be again reduced to the former strength of 800 men, which had been the strength recommended by Lord Hardinge. This opinion, however, of the Governor-General had exclusive reference to considerations of economy and of military efficiency, and was not founded on any jealousy or suspicion as to the spirit of the native army. The other measure to which we have referred was one of far greater importance, and has a much closer bearing on the danger which had so long been gathering, but which had lain so long concealed. The regular regiments of the line in the Bengal army had long been recruited principally in the same country and from the same high caste. They had thus acquired a peculiar character, and carried to the farthest limit compatible with any kind of military obedience the insane prejudices of their 'peculiar institution.' These had been always treated by the English officers not only with respect, but with some tinge even of that kind of sympathy

which infects the mind from the mere force of habitual contact with a prevailing sentiment. The history of the world presents no more strange anomaly than the well-tryed and desperate fidelity of the Bengal Sepoy to men whose touch, — nay whose very shadow was, under certain circumstances, a pollution worse than death. But these prejudices had not interfered with the fidelity of the soldier, and the Bengal Sepoy had never failed to follow our standard against that of his own faith and race. For the first time in the Affghan war, when the Brahmin regiments were carried beyond the Indus, — the sacred boundary of their holy land, — a general impression arose that the delusions and prejudices of caste had been found to interfere with the duties of a soldier.* Sir Charles Napier was not the man to treat with patience anything which stood in the way of absolute military obedience. He looked in an army above all things for those qualities which would enable him to say of it, as Wellington in 1814 could say of the noble army which he led from Lisbon to Toulouse — that it was ‘an army which would go anywhere and do anything.’ His fine military instincts led him, accordingly, to turn with delight to those irregular corps which the many warlike races of India are so well able to supply, and whose aptitude for our military service had been already effectively proved on the field of battle. In the following passage, speaking of adopting the Ghoorka regiments into the line, Sir Charles Napier touches with characteristic genius on a matter of even deeper import than he knew of at the time:—

‘Bravest of native troops, they at the battles of the Sutlej displayed such conspicuous gallantry as to place them for courage on a level with our Europeans; and certainly they have a high military spirit, are fierce in war, of unsurpassed activity, and possess great powers of enduring fatigue. . . . Now when the mutinous spirit arose with our Sepoys, the chief leaders were undoubtedly Brahmins, and Brahmins, having a religious as well as a military character, enjoy an immense influence. All the higher Hindoo castes are imbued with gross superstitions. One goes to the devil if he eats this; another, if he eats that; a third will not touch his dinner if the shadow of an infidel passes over it; a fourth will not drink water unless it has

* We suspect that there was some exaggeration on this subject, and that the impression was founded on circumstances comparatively trivial. In 1857 Lord Melville made a speech in the House of Lords which had considerable effect from the narrative it contained of a Sepoy regiment having refused, on account of caste prejudices, to work at the trenches at the siege of Mooltan. We have since observed that this story was positively contradicted by the officer in command of the accused regiment. Lord Melville probably repeated the story from hearsay evidence.

been drawn by one of his own caste. Thus their religious principles interfere in many strange ways with their military duties. The men of the 35th Native Infantry lost caste because they did their duty as soldiers at Jelalabad; that is, they fought like soldiers, and ate what could be had to sustain their strength for battle. There never was a stronger proof than the annoyance which this noble regiment is said to have since received from others, of the injury which high caste in a soldier does, and the Brahmin is the worst. Having two commanders to obey, caste and captain, if they are at variance, the last is disobeyed, or obeyed at the cost of conscience and of misery. Military rules sit light on the low caste man, and as a soldier he is superior. If caste chimes in with duty he is glad of it; if not, he snaps his fingers at caste. When it was made known that Brahmins were at the head of the insubordinate men of the 13th and 22nd, and that in the first regiment alone there were no less than 430, the necessity of teaching that race they should no longer dictate to the Sepoys and the Government struck me, and my thoughts at once turned for means to the Goorkas, whose motto was "eat, drink, and be merry." Their tenets are unknown to me: it is said they do not like cow-beef; yet a cow would not be long alive with a hungry Goorka battalion. They mess together these Goorkas, and make few inquiries as to the sex of a beef-steak! These, therefore, were men with which to meet the Brahmins of Bengal, and their bristling prejudices of high caste.' (*Indian Misgovernment*, p. 33, 40.)

Long before this the exigencies of our position had led to the formation of local and irregular corps. Indeed, there had been no increase in the number of the regiments of the line since 1825. Some local corps had been raised by Sir Charles Napier in Scinde; but the system was largely developed under Lord Dalhousie, especially in the Punjab, at the suggestion and through the agency of Henry Lawrence. The organisation of the Punjab Irregular Force was a measure which had a most powerful influence on the events which followed. No less than ten regiments were raised, equipped, and disciplined from the races which we had just subdued. This was exclusive of a large force of military police. The whole of these levies were separated from the Bengal Sepoys by important differences of tradition or of race; and when the time of trial came they supplied a force of nearly 20,000 men, on whose fidelity the two Lawrences did not count in vain, and by whose aid their saving work was done.

There is one other measure in respect to the Bengal army which, though not actually adopted in Lord Dalhousie's time, was strongly recommended by him, and was in course of being adopted when the great mutiny afterwards arose. It was a measure bearing very closely, though indirectly, on the jealous

and exclusive character of the Bengal Sepoy. When Lord Dalhousie was organising the expeditionary force against Burmah, the 38th Regiment of Native Infantry refused to go beyond sea. The oath under which the native army was enlisted had been drawn up in 1786, and had been never changed. It bound the Sepoy 'to march wherever he was directed, whether within or beyond the Company's territories;' but it had been always held that the word 'march' was confined to movement by land, and that the Sepoy was not bound to submit to transport by sea. Six regiments only of the whole Bengal infantry were enlisted as general service corps, although the whole armies of Madras and Bombay were available beyond sea. In the case of all these various regiments no difficulty had ever been found in recruiting for general service; nor did it appear that there was any inferiority in the military character of the recruits; none, at least, which should induce the Government to maintain a distinction so inconvenient to itself. Lord Dalhousie therefore recommended, that, in future, all new enlistments for the infantry of Bengal should be made on the terms of their being general service corps. The fact that this measure tended to break up the close brotherhood and exclusive caste of the Bengal army must have rendered it distasteful to the classes and families from which they had been so long raised. This discontent may possibly have been among the causes predisposing to the events which followed. But if so, it may well be questioned whether it was not a discontent proving that the necessity of the measure was greater even than it was supposed to be.

There was yet another change in the condition of the native army which had been arising gradually for many years, and which did not escape the anxious notice of Lord Dalhousie. Those soldier-statesmen who have been bred in the service of the East India Company, and whose character has so often shed imperishable lustre on the English name, were a race of men drawn from the European officers of the native army. As our empire was extended, the drain upon the staff of the army became more and more exhausting, until at last it was apparent that the Sepoy regiments had been to a large extent deprived of the presence and the care of those on whom their discipline and fidelity must, in the main, depend. This most serious evil had been of long standing, but it was aggravated by the additional demand for officers in the extensive provinces recently acquired, and in the superintendence of public works. It was not merely on civil and scientific employments that their services had been required, but largely also on the purely military duty of or-

ganising and commanding the irregular and local corps which had saved the Government from increasing the regular regiments of the line. Within a few years the Sikh Local Corps, the Guides, the Punjaub Irregular Force, the Pegue and Nagpore Forces, besides eight regiments of irregular cavalry, had all been raised and organised under European officers drawn from the native army of the Three Presidencies. The Company, in order to secure some measure of attention to regimental duty, had laid down regulations limiting the number of officers who could be withdrawn for detached duty from each regiment. But these regulations had been from the first defective — taking no account of absentees from other causes — and, such as they were, it had been absolutely impossible to adhere to them. To such an extent had this evil gone that, in 1856, no less than 803 officers were detached from the Bengal army alone, whereas, according to the regulations, the number ought not to have exceeded 540. Lord Dalhousie proposed that measures should be taken, and new regulations laid down, the object of which should be to fix, not merely the maximum number which might be withdrawn for special purposes from each regiment, but a minimum number which must be always present with the corps. He proposed further the formation of a Staff Corps, such as has been now actually established. The whole subject was one which seems to have been strongly impressed upon his mind. He said:—

‘I feel it to relate to a point which is of infinite importance to the efficiency of the Indian army, and therefore think it my duty to moot it for most serious and early consideration. The employment of military officers in all capacities — staff, detached, civil and scientific — which has been so greatly extended of late years, has been very advantageous to the interests of officers, and of great value to the Government in the several departments to which they have been admitted. But looking at the practice in a military point of view, I regard it with considerable uneasiness, as likely to act injuriously in many ways upon the efficiency, discipline, and military spirit of the Company’s army.’

It is impossible to pass from the circumstances affecting at this time the condition and temper of the native army, without reference to the fact that the terrible necessities of the Russian war had compelled the Government at home to diminish sensibly the number of European regiments in India — thus disturbing that proportion between the two armies on which so much depends. It is true that this reduction was intended to be temporary; but the balance was not in fact restored until the time came when the flower of the British army was called to India for the recovery of an empire very nearly lost. Lord Dalhousie

saw the necessity for a temporary reduction of the European force with regret: but the risk which was actually incurred thereby was not the risk against which he had it in his mind to guard. There was not, indeed, any danger which he considered imminent; but the possibility to which Indian statesmen and Indian soldiers always looked was a combination between two or more of the native Powers which still retained some military strength—such especially as Cashmere and Afghanistan on the north with Nepal on the eastern frontier. This was a combination much dwelt upon by Sir Charles Napier in his ‘Memoir on the Defence of India,’ and it was one the possibility of which Lord Dalhousie thought ought never to be wholly disregarded. But besides this, or any other specific danger, the past history of India had naturally impressed on every mind a vague but well-founded sense of the variety of contingencies which might involve the Government in some unforeseen emergency. This state of things was inseparable from the very nature of our dominion; and founded on this it was Lord Dalhousie’s strong opinion that the relative strength of European and native troops ought to be very closely watched from time to time; not, indeed, on any abstract principle of proportion between the two races, but with reference to the actual condition, internal and external, of our dominions. Looking at that condition as it stood towards the close of his administration, he was of opinion that the smallest amount of European infantry which could be relied upon as fully adequate for the defence of India, and for the preservation of internal tranquillity, was thirty-five battalions, of which not less than nineteen ought to belong to Bengal with its dependent provinces, nine to Madras, and seven to Bombay. At that time there were in Bengal only sixteen battalions; one having been sent to the Crimea, and two being stationed in Pegue. Of the nineteen battalions Lord Dalhousie was of opinion that not less than ten should be stationed below Umballah, and five below Agra. For it is important to observe, as bearing on the events which followed, that the location of the European troops had undergone a change which proved to be a serious danger. As our frontier receded, the location of the bulk of our small European army receded also. The vast line of country between Calcutta and Agra was left with only two or three regiments, stationed at points many hundred miles apart. Twenty years before, there had been not less than six European regiments in the lower provinces, between Calcutta and Allahabad. Lord Dalhousie found in the same space only two regiments, and he never was able to increase the number. It had been to meet in some measure the views

of the Indian Government on this subject that Sir Charles Wood had proposed, in the Bill of 1853, that the number of local European troops which the Company were allowed to maintain in India should be raised from a maximum of 12,000 to a maximum of 20,000 men. This provision received the assent of Parliament; and, in pursuance of it, one additional European regiment had been raised for each of the three Presidencies before the end of Lord Dalhousie's rule. But, notwithstanding this provision, the total number of European troops had suffered a gradual diminution from 48,709, at which they stood in 1852, to 45,322, at which they stood when Lord Dalhousie closed his government in India.

It would have been strange if one of the most distinguished disciples of Sir Robert Peel had exercised for eight years supreme power in India, without applying to its commercial system some of those principles which had made such advance at home, and which are founded on natural laws of universal application. Accordingly differential duties on foreign ships were abolished, and the coasting trade of India was set entirely free. A duty on the import of raw cotton into the North-Western Provinces was abolished. The frontier customs duties in the Punjab were abolished also. In like manner, for similar reasons, all customs and all export duties on the river Indus were abandoned; and ultimately the land frontier customs were abolished in Scinde, as they had already been abolished in the Punjab.

The period of Lord Dalhousie's rule is remarkable for the full and final declaration by the Government of India of its intentions on the difficult subject of native education. It had been long before that Government recognised the fact that we had any duty to discharge in this matter towards the people of India. And when the duty was recognised a difficulty arose in respect to the manner of performing it which was due to the peculiar character and history of the Indian race. The same question could never have arisen in respect to any of the heathen people who had been brought elsewhere under our dominion. The Indian people had a literature and a civilisation older than our own—a literature dating back to a language which was the great forefather of all the tongues of Europe. What, then, was the education which we were bound to give them? Should it be an education in our literature and our knowledge, saturated as it was with our religion; or should it be an education in their own ancient languages and theology? The traditional feeling of the East India Company was something more than tolerance. It was a dread of even presenting

to the eyes or minds of the Indian people any teaching which might cross the traditions of their faith, or which could afford any explanation or profession of our own. Accordingly the first vague efforts after native education which received any recognition from the Government, were efforts to revive the old learning and old philosophy of the East. The attempt was futile—as futile as efforts would have been to revive the Mastodon. What the Indian of our day wanted, whether he was Hindoo or Mahomedan, was some insight into the literature and science which were the life of his own time, and of the vigorous race which were the representative of all knowledge and all power to him. It is strange that any other idea of education should have ever been entertained. Yet previous to 1835, all the establishments for education supported by the Government, with the exception of the Hindoo College at Calcutta, were Oriental in character. The medium of instruction was Oriental. The mode of instruction was Oriental. The whole scope of the instruction was Oriental, designed to conciliate old prejudices and to propagate old ideas. It is due to the Court of Directors at home to say that before this time they had pointed to instruction in European literature as the kind of education to which our efforts should be directed. At last, in 1835, the late Lord Macaulay, being then Chairman of the Board of Public Instruction in Calcutta, denounced the system which had been pursued with a vigour and eloquence which proved decisive:—

‘If,’ he said, ‘it be the opinion of the Government that the present system ought to remain unchanged, I beg that I may be permitted to retire from the chair. I feel that I could not be of the smallest use there. I feel also that I should be lending my countenance to what I firmly believe to be a mere delusion. I believe that the present system tends not to accelerate the progress of truth, but to delay the natural death of expiring errors. I conceive that we have at present no right to the respectable name of a Board of Public Instruction. We are a Board for wasting public money, for printing books which are of less value than the paper on which they are printed was while it was blank; for giving artificial encouragement to absurd history, absurd metaphysics, absurd physics, absurd theology; for raising up a breed of scholars who find their scholarship an encumbrance and a blemish.’

One month after this paper was written, the Governor-General (Lord W. Bentinck) in Council, issued a minute declaring it to be the opinion of the Government that ‘its great object ought to be the promotion of European literature and science among the nations of India.’ Still the efforts of the Government were feeble, reaching for the most part only the upper classes in the Presidency towns. To reach the

masses of the people the vernacular languages must be employed as the medium of instruction, and some link established between the Government and the native institutions. Education in this sense received its first great impulse from the hands of Mr. Thomason, in the North-Western Provinces, who obtained permission to establish a Government school in every Tehsildare within eight districts in Hindoostan. The measure was declaredly experimental; but it was attended with such signal success that, in 1853, Lord Dalhousie very earnestly recommended that the system of vernacular education, which had proved so effectual, should be extended to the whole of the North-Western Provinces. Not only was this large measure recommended for immediate adoption, but similar measures were advised for the lower provinces of Bengal, and for the Punjaub; with such modifications as their various circumstances might be found to require.

While these and other proposals for the extension of vernacular education were still before the Home Government, the Court of Directors addressed to the Government of India their great education despatch, dated July 1854. It contained a scheme of education for all India, far wider and more comprehensive than the local Government had suggested. Lord Dalhousie very truly says of this despatch — which India owes to Sir Charles Wood, who was then President of the Board of Control — that ‘It left nothing to be desired, if, indeed, it did not authorise and direct that more should be done than is within our present grasp.’ In directing the establishment of vernacular schools throughout the districts, of Government colleges of a higher grade, and of a university in each of the three Presidencies, — above all, in establishing the principle of grants in aid to all institutions which are open to inspection, and give a good education, — this despatch lays the foundation of a system capable of indefinite extension, and to a great extent solves the ‘religious difficulty’ in the same way in which it has been solved in England.

The Government of India had from the first established liberty of conscience with one strange exception. Converts to Mahometanism had always been protected — because our courts administered both Hindoo and Mahomedan law; and when a native passed from under the one code, he came under the protection of the other. But when a Hindoo embraced Christianity, he was left liable to loss of property, in addition to the many other sacrifices against which no law could secure him. Lord Dalhousie’s Government abolished this strange and discreditable anomaly. It did so not without some resistance;

and the records of the Parliamentary Committees which sat in 1853, on Indian affairs, prove that there were not wanting among our public men some whose ideas of toleration did not embrace the case of a Christian convert. 'I hate a man who changes his religion,' is a sentiment which we once heard expressed by a very liberal politician; and it is one which is perhaps more often entertained than honestly avowed.

But we must close. The Government of India is an immense subject, and the eight years of Lord Dalhousie's rule was a time of intense activity. Of the infinite variety of subjects which press on the mind of a Governor-General who really does his work, we can only touch, in an article such as this, on a very few; and of these few we must dismiss in a single line questions which were the burden of long and exhausting hours. Lord Dalhousie was an indefatigable worker. From the most distant parts of the dominions which he governed, every one of his Lieutenants were sure of immediate attention to their demands, and a speedy answer to their despatches. For the most part the men chosen for the post of Governor-General of India have not been men likely to attain the highest office of all in politics at home. But Lord Dalhousie, in our opinion, was one of these. He had large views, a rapid intellect, indefatigable industry, admirable habits of business, great self-reliance. He was a vigorous writer, and had the faculty of ready speech. Conscious of his own powers, and of the position he had secured in Parliament, he knew the sacrifice he made in accepting even that 'imperial appointment' which is the greatest office England has to give, except the government of herself. In its noble but laborious duties he worked without ceasing to the last. When he sailed from Calcutta he left behind him in India, and when he reached home he found in England, the universal impression due to a long and splendid administration. That impression has been for a time obscured by the occurrence of calamities sudden and terrible indeed. The popular mind, never very steady under the impulse of such events, is all the more easily shaken when very deep interest is joined to very imperfect knowledge. During the two years, or more, when every fifth-rate writer and speaker thought it necessary to have his say against something which he called 'Lord Dalhousie's policy,' Lord Dalhousie himself maintained a silence which must have been painful, but which we think was right. He could not well have spoken except in his place in Parliament; and in that place he never appeared again. He felt, and he expressed the feeling, that a time which was a time of intense anxiety to all, and of agony to not a few, was no

time even to think of any injustice suffered by himself. There was, after all, nothing to answer which could not be answered by a simple reference to official records of the past. To 'Lord Dalhousie's policy' in the Punjaub — to the men he chose — to the forces he organised — to the people he conciliated — we owe in a very large degree the salvation of India. If it had been possible to carry into effect at once the policy he recommended in respect to the number and distribution of European troops in the Lower Provinces, it is not too much to say that there would have been no massacre of Cawnpore, and no abandonment of Lucknow. We have seen how largely his policy in other matters has been misrepresented and misunderstood. Farther evidences of this, on yet other questions, will come before us when we deal with the rule of his successor. Meanwhile, we close this review of an eventful time with the expression of a firm belief that, when the records of our empire in the East are closed, Lord Dalhousie's administration will be counted with the greatest that have gone before it; and that among the benefactors of the Indian people no name will have a better place than his.

ART. II.—*Aus dem Nachlass VARNHAGEN'S VON ENSE. Tagebücher von FRIEDRICH VON GENTZ. Mit einem Vor- und Nach-Worte von VARNHAGEN VON ENSE.* Leipzig: 1861.

WE invite attention to the life and writings of Gentz, for reasons widely different from those which commonly induce the analysis of a character or the review of a biography. He is not a specimen of a period, an illustration of a calling, or an example of a class. He is in no sense a 'representative man.' He stands alone in his peculiar and personal description of celebrity; presenting, we believe, the solitary instance of a political aspirant achieving, along with enduring reputation, a position of social equality with statesmen and nobles, in an aristocratic country and under a despotic government, by his pen. He starts with no advantage of birth or fortune, and he never acquires wealth; he produces no work of creative genius; he does not intrigue, cringe, or flatter; he does not get on by patronage; he is profuse without being venal; he is always on the side which he thinks right: yet we find him, almost from the commencement to the very close of his career, the companion and counsellor of the greatest and most distinguished of his contemporaries—the petted member of the most brilliant and exclusive of European circles. In early manhood he had earned

the hatred of Napoleon and the friendship of Pitt. In declining age he was at once the trusted friend of Metternich, the correspondent of Mackintosh, the Platonic adorer of Rahel, and the favoured lover of Fanny Elsler.

Excitements and enjoyments of all sorts—from flattered vanity and gratified love to the proud consciousness of continental fame and influence—follow each other in rapid succession, or come together in intoxicating confusion. Beyle says of himself that he required three or four cubic feet of new ideas per day, as a steunboat requires coal. What would have been a reasonable allowance for Gentz? How did he win his way to that giddy pinnacle, which was to him—whatever it may seem to cooler heads or less excitable temperaments—the quintessence of enjoyment, the crowning test and token of success? How or where did he find health, strength, time, mind, or money for the wear and tear of the contest, the lavish pecuniary expenditure and the reckless intellectual waste of the strife?

• Speaking of the position won by Sheridan, Moore asserts that ‘by him who has not been born among the great, this can only be achieved by politics. In that arena, which they look upon as their own, the legislature of the land, let a man of genius but assert his supremacy,—at once all barriers of reserve and pride give way, and he takes by right a station at their side which a Shakspeare or a Newton would but have enjoyed by courtesy.’ There was no legislature of the land open to Gentz; and (although he has often been called the Burke of Germany) no fair parallel can be drawn between him and Burke or Sheridan in England, or Guizot and Thiers in France. With rare exception, political writers, as such, have enjoyed no social superiority over the miscellaneous throng of authors in any country: not unfrequently the precise contrary has been their lot; and when Paul Louis Courier was apostrophised as *Vil Pamphlétaire*, the phrase, he tells us, brought down an accumulated mass of prejudice upon his head. The Augustan age of Anne presents, we believe, the only period of party warfare or civil dissension during which the writer or journalist ranked with the statesman; and the terms on which Swift lived with Oxford and Bolingbroke come nearest to those on which Gentz associated with the leading members of European congresses.

• The assistance of Swift, says Scott, ‘was essential to the existence of the ministry, and ample confidence was the only terms on which it could be procured.’ The assistance of Gentz was essential to the cause of European independence

from 1797 to 1815, and eminently useful to the cause of enlightened Conservatism till his death. It was he who clothed in the loftiest and most impressive language the views and principles of those who, with varying fortunes, perseveringly bore up against the sustained and oft-renewed efforts of the French despot to domineer over and humiliate their common fatherland. It was he who suggested the most effective means of making head against the foe—who infused fresh spirit and energy into their counsels when they flagged. We shall see that he was something widely different from the ready penman, clerk, or secretary, who finds apt words for the sense (or nonsense) that may be dictated to him. Being generally present at the preliminary discussions, he was seldom the exponent of a policy which he had not framed or modified, and never of a policy which he disapproved. He is therefore justly and happily termed by Varnhagen, '*dieser Schriftsteller-Staatsmann*,' (this writer-statesman). Perfect equality, if not superiority, is necessarily conceded to a master-mind employed in this fashion; and Gentz was one of those genial natures that irresistibly attract confidence. He was emphatically what the Spaniards call *simpatico*; his tone and manner were electrical; and whenever he was brought into contact with men or women of genius and sensibility, a cordial intimacy was the result. Few things are more striking in the 'Remains' of Mrs. Trench than the easy matter-of-course way in which, a day or two after her arrival at a capital or *Residenz*, she becomes a courted inmate of the best houses. Precisely the same problem is suggested by Gentz's diaries; and the solution of it may be found in the lady's recorded impressions when they met at Berlin in 1800 and she finds him 'one of those who seem to impart a portion of their own endowments; for you feel your mind elevated whilst in his society.' There is a freemasonry between highly endowed and highly refined persons which sweeps away at once all thought of social inequality; and if no inferiority is felt on one side, no superiority will be even momentarily assumed upon the other.

'Mr. Harley,' says Swift, in the 'Journal to Stella,' 'desired me to dine with him again to-day; but I refused him, for I fell out with him yesterday, and will not see him again till he makes me amends.' The cause of quarrel was the offer of a banknote of fifty pounds, which Swift, who was looking to high Church preferment for his reward, indignantly refused. Gentz, who could be adequately rewarded in no other manner, and was never in circumstances to work gratuitously, affected no delicacy in this respect. He took money, right and left, from

every one who resorted to his pen, or who benefited, or hoped to benefit, by his services. We shall find him repeatedly receiving large sums or valuable presents in various shapes, from England, Prussia, and France. His private friends, also, were frequently laid under contribution, and Varnhagen introduces the member of a wealthy firm giving vent to an illustrative lament over his grave:—‘That was a friend, indeed! I shall never have such another. He has cost me large sums—it would not be believed how large—for he had only to write upon a bill what he wished to have, and he had it instantly; but since he is no longer there, I see, for the first time, what we have lost, and I would give three times as much to call him back to life.’

Alderman Beckford used to say that he lost enormously by speculating on the information he received from Lord Chatham; and it may be doubted whether this accommodating banker was remunerated by intelligence. It is admitted on all hands that Gentz, although especially conversant with financial subjects, never gambled in the funds, and this is one main topic relied on by his apologists. They, moreover, assert with truth that he never, either in writing or speaking, belied his honest convictions; and they plausibly contend that he received in the long run less than many public men of far inferior desert were paid in salaries. They might point to Burke’s pension, or to the income settled on Fox by his dissentient followers, or to the 12,000*l.* raised by private subscription for Pitt. But these great men would, one and all, stand better with posterity if they had never been subjected to pecuniary obligations; and there is an obvious difference between the acceptance of a pension or a loan and an habitual reliance on precarious and irregular supplies. ‘Let all your views in life,’ writes Junius to Woodfall, ‘be directed to a solid, however moderate, independence: without it no man can be happy, nor even honest.’ Gentz remained honest, as this world goes; but his peace of mind was constantly disturbed by his embarrassments, and, unfounded as it was, he must have writhed under the taunt which Napoleon hurled at him in one of his vengeful bulletins, as a mercenary scribe. There have been men of genius in all ages who could never be taught the true value and proper use of money; taking it carelessly with one hand, and flinging it away as carelessly with the other. They were not more ready to borrow than to give or lend; if they expected other people’s purses to be open, their own were open in return—only, unhappily, there was commonly nothing in them. Fielding, Savage, Sheridan, Coleridge, Godwin, and Leigh Hunt are well-known examples

of this peculiarity. Gentz was another; and the best that can be said for him is that, not caring for money for its own sake, he lay under little temptation to procure it by unworthy compliances, whilst his unconsciousness of abasement saved him from one of the worst effects of pecuniary obligation, the forfeiture of self-respect.

There is no regular Life of Gentz, nor any complete edition of his writings. A spirited biographical sketch has been supplied by Varnhagen von Ense*, who, whilst fully appreciating his genius and making large allowances for his aberrations, obviously differed from him in tastes and habits, as well as in personal and political predilections, and never lived much or intimately with him at any time. He has also been made the subject of many animated attacks, and as animated defences or apologies. To him, indeed, was first applied the description which, with the change of nation, was adopted by O'Connell for himself—that he was the best abused man in Germany. Two editions of his works have been commenced and left incomplete; and a third was planned under auspices which bade fair to render it an enduring monument of his fame. The Baron von Prokech-Osten, the present representative of Austria at the Porte, was from early youth the constant companion and enthusiastic admirer of Gentz, working with him, reading with him, attending political consultations with him, and sharing equally the amusements of his lighter hours and the grave cares of statesmanship. The Baron is a distinguished traveller and author, as well as a highly-accomplished diplomatist, and had every imaginable qualification for what would have been to him a labour of love. He was encouraged to undertake the editorship by Prince Metternich, and was actually engaged in the requisite preparations, when the Austrian Police, or Home Office, interfered, and the design was perforce abandoned.

The materials, had he been permitted the free use of them, would have been abundant and of the richest quality. On Gentz's death, in pursuance of a well-known German practice, the Austrian Government took possession of the whole of his papers, public and private, which lay within reach of the officials. Amongst these were many of the day-books, or diaries, which he had kept with scrupulous minuteness from the time when he began to rise into celebrity. Some are now in the possession of his friend, who has been so good as to allow us a cursory inspection of them; and the '*Tagebücher*,' published by Varnhagen von Ense in 1861, is an abridgement, by Gentz himself, of his

* *Vermischte Schriften. Zweiter Theil. 1843.*

diaries from April, 1800, to the end of 1814, and for a few detached weeks of 1819. He burnt the original note-books for these years, after extracting what he thought worth preserving and saw no reason to suppress, and it was his intention, had he lived, to deal in the same manner with the rest. He was fortunately endowed with a proud self-consciousness, and felt that he could afford to be frank. The result is, that many of the entries preserved by him are confessions and self-communings rather than memoranda of events: he has left their freshness unimpaired: and, alternating with literary, political and social triumphs, appear the frequently-recurring proofs of his faults and his weaknesses.

We have no means of knowing when, if ever, the rest of the diaries will see the light. If any of them have fallen into the hands of Varnhagen's niece, Miss Ludmilla Assig, she will not be prevented, by scruples of delicacy, from turning them to the most profitable account. In the meantime, we have ample materials for such a sketch as can be brought within the compass of these pages.

Frederic Gentz was born in Breslau, May 2, 1764. His father had a situation in the Mint: his mother was an Ancillon. They had four children, and he was the youngest of two sons. His education began at the town school, and on his father's removal to Berlin, as Mint Director, he was sent to a Gymnasium there, and afterwards to the University of Frankfort-on-the-Oder. With the exception of a solitary success in recitation, he showed no sign of talent, spirit, or capacity. His family set him down as a dunce; and the good qualities he was admitted to possess were not of a nature to advance him in the world. He was goodnatured, kindhearted, and generous to excess. His sisters got all they wanted from him for the asking, and so, it seems, did his associates; for as regards lending and borrowing, the boy was literally the father of the man. It was not until he attended Kant's lectures at Königsberg, in his twentieth or twenty-first year, that he displayed the least desire of distinction or consciousness of power. Then a sudden change came over him: it was like the breaking up of a frost, or the warming of Pygmalion's statue into life. When he returned to Berlin, in 1785, it was difficult to retrace the indolent, commonplace lad who had been the despair of his parents, in the clever, lively, accomplished, and aspiring young man who was now their pride and their hope. If the first inspiration, however, came from Kant, the great metaphysician did not exercise his usual cloud-compelling influence over his young disciple, whose clear, practical understanding, once unsealed,

grappled eagerly with the tangible and useful in knowledge, the refining and elevating in art. Besides mastering the Greek and Roman classics, he acquired so perfect a knowledge of French as to compose and converse in it as easily as in his native tongue, and a sufficient familiarity with English to enable him to translate Burke.

How and at what particular period he obtained his wonderful familiarity with some English subjects which till recently were imperfectly understood in England, especially our commercial system and our finance, is a puzzle to us. All we know is that his was one of those gifted minds which accumulate treasures whilst they appear to be picking up pebbles or trifling with straws, and can devote night after night begun in dissipation or frivolity to hard study or patient investigation. On his arrival in Berlin, one of the most brilliant and popular members of the gay world, attracted by congeniality of tastes and pursuits, introduced him to the best society, in which he speedily became a favourite; and before he had well time to look about him, he was involved in a giddy whirl of what is conventionally called pleasure, besides intrigues or love affairs, which are sad consumers of time. The state of his heart and mind at this epoch may be collected from the earliest of his published letters 'To Elizabeth,' the wife of Councillor Graun during the correspondence, and afterwards of the poet Stage-man. At the date of the first, February 12, 1785, she was in her nineteenth year, separated from her husband, very handsome, very clever, and both ready and qualified to condole with young gentlemen suffering from the prevalent malady, which, for want of a fitter term, may be called Wertherism. Its principal symptoms were a morbid craving for excitement, and the treatment of marriage as a kind of legalised slavery.

'Love, free as air, at sight of human ties,
Spreads its light wings and in a moment flies.'

Gentz gave the lady ample occasion for the employment of her powers of soothing; for in less than two years he makes her the *confidante* of two passions, each of which was to last for ever, and uniformly addresses her with a warmth which might lead unsophisticated readers to suspect that she was all along the object of a third. She was, however, herself beloved by a gentleman named Le Noble, and Gentz, after urgently pressing on her the moral duty of consulting her adorer's happiness as well as her own, recommends the careful study of 'La Nouvelle Heloise' by way of preparation for the task. He himself, at this time, was paying honourable court to a damsel named

Celestine, who, after entering into an engagement with him, backed out of it; wisely and fortunately enough, for it would have been little less than a miracle for a man with his volatility and impressibility, to make a good husband. The experiment was soon afterwards tried by another lady who is briefly described by Varnhagen as *née Gilly*, and it turned out as might have been anticipated. Fletcher, Byron's favourite servant, naively remarked, that every woman could manage my lord, except my lady. Almost every woman was acceptable to Gentz, except his wife. From the domestic arrangements for the meditated marriage with Celestine, we learn that, with his father's assistance, he hoped to make up an income of 800 dollars. In 1786 he was appointed private secretary to the Royal General-Directorium (whatever that may be), and gave such satisfaction to his superiors that he was speedily promoted to the higher grade of *Kriegsrath* (war-councillor).

Gentz, like many other men of mark who afterwards became firm opponents of revolutionary opinions, looked hopefully at first on the great events of 1789. But the excesses of democracy, and dread of the military despotism to which they were obviously leading, awoke him from his brief dream of human perfectibility, and his literary career commenced, in 1793, with a translation of Burke's famous 'Essay on the French Revolution.' In 1794 he published a translation, with preface and remarks, of Mallet du Pan's book on the same subject; and in 1795, a translation, with remarks and additions, of a work in the same spirit by Mounier. On the accession of Frederic William III. to the throne of Prussia, in November, 1797, Gentz ventured on the bold and (for a Prussian official) unprecedented step of addressing what he termed a *Sendschreiben* (missive) to his new sovereign on his rights, duties, and opportunities. It is a pamphlet of thirty-two pages, somewhat in the style of Bolingbroke's 'Patriot King.' He was a frequent contributor, as an avowed champion of reaction, to periodicals; and, amongst other articles of note, wrote one which might more properly be denominated an essay against Robespierre and St. Just.

In January, 1795, he founded and edited the 'Neue Deutsche Monatschrift' (German New Monthly), which lasted only four numbers; and in January, 1799, in co-operation with Professor Ancillon, and with funds supplied by a minister, he established the 'Historisches Journal,' which was continued monthly till the end of 1800; after which it appeared every three or four months, till its expiration in 1802. His own contributions were mostly of a comprehensive and sustained character, com-

posed with the view of being subsequently republished as books. In this shape was first given to the world his 'Essay on the Actual State of the Administration of the Finances and "the National Wealth of Great Britain"—dedicated to Sir Francis d'Ivernois. It was translated by the author into French, and published at London, Paris, and Hamburgh in 1800. About the same time he wrote and published an historical fragment on Mary Queen of Scots, which was deemed worthy of a French translation by M. Damaze de Raymond in 1813. Another series of articles in the 'Historisches Journal,' 'On the Origin 'and Character of the War against the French Revolution,' was composed with express reference to Great Britain; and before the end of the century he had visited England, and formed intimate relations, based on mutual respect and confidence, with (amongst many others) Mackintosh, Lord Grenville, and Pitt. For more than twenty years he remained in constant and confidential communication with the leading members of successive English ministries, who, besides resorting to him for information touching continental matters, made free use of his pen in drawing up papers on English taxation, paper-money, and finance. From 1800 inclusive, we are enabled to track his progress, step by step, in the diaries; and, through the kindness of Baron Prokesch, we have the additional aid of a note-book, in Gentz's handwriting, entitled, 'Liste Générale des 'Personnes que j'ai vues depuis le commencement de l'année '1800,' headed by the following 'Observations:—

'The commencement of the year 1800, or rather the end of 1799, is the epoch at which the sphere of my *luisons* has rapidly and considerably increased. I had very interesting ones before this epoch, and I propose to form a table of them apart; but it is since 1800 that I have properly begun to figure on the stage of the world, that I have constantly lived with men of all classes, and that society has become one of the principal objects of my occupations, of my studies, and of my enjoyments.'

This list, he explains, does not contain ephemeral, commonplace, or insignificant rencounters or acquaintances: 'it is 'absolutely meant only to form the base and furnish the 'elements of a table of social relations and social commerce, 'properly so called.' A list of correspondents is added; and the degrees of intimacy are indicated by marks prefixed to the names—a cross expressing familiar acquaintance, and an asterisk intimacy. It is headed by the royal family, and includes all the personages of note then resident or sojourning in London.

The published diary begins on the 14th April, 1800, and characteristically enough:—

‘On the 14th of April an agreeable surprise. The Jew-Elder Hirsch brought me fifty thalers for drawing up I know not what representation. On the 26th of May, received through Baron Brüdener, as a present from the Emperor of Russia, a watch set with (small) brilliants.’

The word (small) before brilliants would seem to show that, in appreciating honorary gifts, he acted on the same principle as Dr. Parr, who, when consulted about the design of a gold ring destined for him, said he was indifferent about the fashion, but begged that it might be weighty.

The next entry relates to the first English remittance:—

‘June 1.—Received a written communication through Garlicke from Lord Grenville, together with a donation of 500*l.* sterling, the first of this kind!’ (The note of admiration is his own.)

The entries for 1801, though brief, throw light both on his mode of earning large sums of secret-service money, and on his way of spending it:—

‘February.—Very remarkable that, on the one side, Lord Carysfort charged me with the translation into French of the published “English Notes against Prussia,” and, shortly afterwards Count Haugwitz with the translation into German of the “Prussian Notes against England.”

‘Towards the end of March, finished the book on the “Origin of the Revolutionary War,”* and formed the resolution to answer that of Hauteville. This work was undertaken in Schömburg.’

The work of Hauteville was a semi-official attack on England, and its complete refutation by so masterly and well-informed a writer as Gentz, was a valuable service not merely to the libelled country, but to Europe. It was translated into English, with an able preface, by a gentleman who afterwards became a member of the British Cabinet.†

The juxtaposition in the next entry of the dog and the emperor is not inapposite.

‘April.—Deep emotion at the death of a dog. A proof how strongly everything belonging to domestic ties, amidst all dissipation, affected me. News of the death of the Emperor Paul. Impression, which first the universal joy, and later the fearful publication of this news, made on me.’

* ‘Ueber den Ursprung und Character des Krieges gegen die Französische Revolution. Berlin: 1801.’ Republished from the ‘Historisches Journal.’

† The State of Europe before and after the French Revolution. Being an Answer to ‘L’Etat de la France à la Fin de l’An VIII.’ Translated by John Charles Herries, Esq.: 1802.

His mode of life at this time, in its wild recklessness, resembles that of Savage, who often spent in a night's revelry the borrowed money which should have saved him from privation and annoyance for weeks. Thus, after losing seventy-four louisdors at play, he manages with difficulty to raise seventy more by pledging a manuscript, and loses them the same evening at the same house. In the midst of all these follies he writes (Nov. 14.), 'I resolve to travel to Weimar with my brother Henry, and remain there fourteen days.' He went and spent three weeks there, mostly in the Grand Ducal circle, and what he valued more, in daily, almost hourly intercourse with Goethe, Schiller, Herder, Wieland, and Kotzebue; whilst flattered vanity, and favoured if not successful love, kept adding to the intoxication and the charm. His enchantress was a young court beauty, Amalie d'Imhoff, who afterwards acquired some celebrity as a poet. On one occasion he writes: 'I passed the morning at Mlle. d'Imhoff's; it was a remarkable morning—hours which I shall remember to my dying day. I never experienced a sensation equal to that which enchanted me this morning. I even fancied I saw approaching the moment of a great internal revolution.' On another: 'I read and wrote till eleven. I then went to Mlle. d'Imhoff's, where I again enjoyed all that is fine, pure, and grand in the commerce of mankind.'

This visit to Weimar having revealed to him how much elevated and improving pleasure may be derived from the intellect and imagination, apart from the indulgence of the senses, he forms some excellent resolutions, which are forgotten almost immediately after his return to the scene of his repented errors.

'*February 21.*—As I returned home, about two in the morning, I found a letter from my wife which "has decided the fate of my life." And the next day our resolution was taken (probably to separate). This, however, did not prevent me from going to a ball at Poustat's to play *trente-et-quarante*, &c.'

'*April 5.*—Is it credible? The most urgent, the most acute of my miseries was the impossibility of making a present to Christel (an actress), who had her benefit to-day. And, on the same day, fate wafts to the wretch who could write this down a remittance of a thousand pounds from England.'

Well might he exclaim, as he does in a subsequent entry, 'Maintenant c'est le délire complet!' He had just self-command and discretion enough to see that such a life must be broken off at any price; and he came suddenly to the resolution of leaving Berlin, with all its ties, regular and irregular—a resolution doubtless precipitated by the pressure of his debts, the remonstrances of his family, and the (not always) mute reproaches

of his wife. With some difficulty, he obtained leave of absence, having not yet thrown up his employments; and on the 19th of May he writes: 'I take leave of my wife; and on the 20th, at three, I leave Berlin with Adam Müller, never to see it again.'

The biography of men of letters teems with examples of similar incapacity to resist temptation; and one of them, himself deeply culpable, emphatically proclaims, as one of the worst effects of profligacy, that —

‘Oh! it hardens all within,

And petrifies the feeling.’

The disorders of his life did not deaden the sensibilities or cloud the intellect of Gentz; and one reason was, that he never for a moment shut his eyes to the true nature and tendency of his conduct, nor lost his relish for purifying studies and companionship. Our readers will readily recall the scene where Charles Fox, after sitting up all night at Brooks', and losing all he had at hazard, is found the next morning quietly reading Euripides. Gentz, in similar circumstances, could turn with equal ease and gratification to a favourite classic, or speculate with Adam Müller on those sublime mysteries which puzzled Milton's angels. Nor does he appear to have ceased gaining fame and money as a writer at the period when his phrensed pursuit of excitement was most likely to interfere with his political labours and relations.

His abandonment of the Prussian service and naturalisation in Austria, were the gradual and unforeseen result of circumstances. He was neither lured by promises nor fettered by pledges, when, six weeks after his departure with Müller, he arrived in Vienna with Froberg, a companion of a widely-different cast of mind; for they played piquet all the way from Iglau: -

‘I myself (he says) do not know the precise history of my settlement in Vienna. The inconceivable meagreness of the journal leaves me in doubt. It seems that on the one hand Landriani (through Colloredo and Cobentzl), on the other Fasbender, had a hand in it. The latter persuaded me, the very day he presented me to the Archduke Charles, to write a kind of memoir, offering my services,—the only positive step I ever took. The fate of this memoir is unknown to me. After ten or twelve days, I am taken by Colloredo to an audience with the Emperor, who, I distinctly remember, showed no desire to take me into his service. Nevertheless, five days afterwards (Sept. 6th), Cobentzl sent for me, and informed me that the Emperor engaged me as counsellor (*Rath*), with a salary of 5000 gulden (about 200*l.*).’

In another man, we should be apt to term this ignorance of the turning-point of his life affected; but Gentz was so thoroughly

the slave of the moment, so prone to let one range of feelings or impressions absorb or replace another, that imperfect recollection or entire forgetfulness of past events, simply because they were past, was natural to him; and the correspondence relating to the transactions in question is so honourable to him, that he could have had no imaginable motive for suppressing it. The communication of the 6th having been put into official shape, he addressed a manly and eloquent letter to the King of Prussia, requesting not merely his discharge, but some gracious expressions of a nature to repel reproach. The discharge was granted, and was accompanied by an assurance that His Majesty, 'in reference to his merits as a writer, coincided in the general approbation which he had so honourably acquired by them.'

One of the charges subsequently brought against Gentz was, that he had bartered 'the young, aspiring Prussia, with its 'pregnant future,' against 'superannuated, saintish, Romish-imperial Austria.' Admitting (what we should be slow to admit) that Prussia came up to this description as regards her internal policy at any time, her external policy was then to the last degree vacillating and devoid of high principle. She soon afterwards became the complacent ally of France, and condescended to accept Hanover for her subserviency. What would have been the position of Gentz had he remained in her service? He must obviously have laid aside his pen altogether, or have used it to palliate a course of public conduct which he reprobated and despised. This dilemma he evidently foresaw: and the more or less of liberality discoverable in the domestic administration of Prussia, is nothing to the point. What he saw and preferred in Austria was the firm friend of constitutional England, and the determined enemy of revolutionary France. The Austrian statesmen with whom he co-operated were those who successively presided over the department of foreign affairs; and it will be seen that the cordiality of his co-operation was uniformly proportioned to their increasing or diminishing hostility to his own arch foe, Napoleon. Moreover, before Gentz can fairly be made responsible for the despotic and reactionary character of the Imperial régime, it should be shown that the ministers he was supposed to influence had power to modify it; the truth being that the home policy of Austria was under the guidance of a totally different set of men from those whose names are familiarly known to Europe as representing her in foreign courts and congresses. Referring to this particular period, he sets down:—

'What more I did at this time, how I meant to live, how I had lived till then, all is now a mystery to me. In Dresden I mixed as

usual with the fashionable world, with Metternich, Elliot, and other people of distinction; and, quite casually, Elliot proposed to me on the 26th to travel with him to England. So far as I recollect, Metternich gave me a bill on England for 100*l.*, and Armfeldt, from whom the evening before I had won 200 dollars, a similar one. On the 1st of October I travelled alone from Dresden to Weimar. There I lose forty louis-dors to the Duke; send my servant with an endless quantity of letters to Berlin, and wait for Elliot, who arrives punctually on the 6th.

Mr. Elliot, whose witty replies to Frederic the Great have won him a permanent place in the annals of diplomacy, was then English Minister at Dresden. All we learn of their journey is that Gentz was 'auf's äusserste tyrannisirt' (excessively tyrannised over) by his companion; which, perhaps, was the best thing that could happen to a traveller of his wavering mood, ever ready to linger on the road or step aside to gather flowers. The list of distinguished persons by whom he was received in England shows that he turned his visit to good account; and the late Mr. T. Grenville is reported to have called him the best talker he ever heard: adding, 'I had known Gentz intimately at Berlin. When he came to England, he immediately called on me, and earnestly desired to be made personally acquainted with Fox, my brother Lord Grenville, and the other great men of the day. Accordingly, I asked them to dinner with him. They came, and were so charmed with the Prussian statesman that they declared they should be most happy to dine with him again at my house the very next day.' Yet between Fox and Gentz there was no bond of sympathy besides that which almost invariably exists between superior men of all parties. Whilst in England he received a letter from Count Stadion, hastening his return on grounds shrewdly divined and pointedly stated:—

'So far as I can see, people are behaving very well towards you here (Vienna). They tell me that the terms in which the King has granted your discharge are very satisfactory; and there is much less clamour and gossip about you than I apprehended. It is not in the first moment of your settlement in Vienna that the mines will be sprung against you. Jealousy and envy commonly reason too well to discharge their shafts at the time when all the *éclat* of your reputation, and all the pleasure of having gained you to our interests, would serve you as a buckler. It is later, when people have got accustomed to see you every day, to observe you *en robe de chambre*, that you must be on your guard. It is then that those who wish to injure you will have found your weak and your strong side, and try to set their machinations at work.'

He still lingered, and passed some weeks on his return at

Weimar and Dresden, as if instinctively apprehensive of his reception at Vienna; where he finds, on arriving, that his time had not yet come, the Imperial policy being in too wavering a condition to need a counsellor, coadjutor, or penman of his positive ways of thinking and unyielding temper. 'My first interview with Count Cobentzl, and especially with Collenbach, might have shown me that the stage of genuine activity was not yet open to me. I was certainly treated with great respect, but at the same time with mistrust and jealousy; and, in reality, men like these could not well act otherwise towards me.' In the meantime he mixed much in society, and went on forming new and valuable acquaintance. 'Almost the only thing,' he says, 'which I then carried on with eagerness, was my correspondence with England, particularly with Vansittart.' This led to his forming a close intimacy with Sir Arthur Paget, a congenial spirit in many ways, of whom we consequently hear a great deal, not always to the credit of the pair, whose common subjects of interest were play and gallantry, much oftener than diplomacy or politics. At Paget's he met M. de Maistre, with whom he has been frequently, but inaccurately, classed:

'Wonderful is it that this fact was first brought back to my recollection by my old diary. The circumstance that I had seen this great man had entirely escaped my memory; so little impression had he then made upon me. How did that come to pass? I must, however, have held him very high as the author of the "*Considérations sur la Révolution*." Was I spoilt by the every day life of great circles, or too surfeited with diplomatic prattle?'

Another memorable acquaintance was Lord Brougham, who came to Vienna in December, 1804, and, although he had not yet entered Parliament, was rapidly rising into fame. Gentz speaks highly of his understanding, his originality, and his eloquence; but they do not appear to have suited or seen much of each other. About this time he wrote a memoir, addressed to Cobentzl, to prove that the Austrian Cabinet ought not to recognise the Imperial title assumed by Bonaparte. This led to a correspondence with Louis XVIII., from whom he received several autograph letters. In another tract against Napoleon, he had so far counteracted the views of the ministry as to be regarded as their opponent; and when, towards the end of August, 1805, war became inevitable, he was left in complete ignorance of all that was going on behind the scenes, and had good reason to dread an entire loss of influence and consideration as the result:—

'It was a fatal epoch. Had I only in June conducted myself with more calmness and prudence towards Wintzingerode, who came to

Vienna on the part of Russia to make provision for the joint war, and was ready to grant me his full confidence, I had still been able to effect an honourable retreat and do much good. But I fell from one mistake into another.'

His mistakes mattered nothing. Whenever the spirit of revolutionary despotism, embodied in Napoleon, was to be encountered in right earnest, on sound principles, and with broad, unselfish, truly elevated views, his co-operation was universally felt to be indispensable. There was not another pen in Germany, nor perhaps in Europe, that could give equal force to the combined protest of insulted sovereigns and suppressed nationalities, or fling an equal halo round their cause. He was as sure to be called for in the emergency as the popular commander by whom the armies were to be led; and we were not at all surprised to read, directly after the last burst of despondency:—

'On the 14th of September a grand reconciliation took place between me and Count Cobentzl. I now resolved to take up the pen for Austria, and sketched the plan of a work on the balance of power. To carry out this plan, which Cobentzl highly approved, I immediately settled down in my old summer residence at Hietzing, where I satisfactorily completed several sections.'

He was simultaneously employed in putting the finishing touch to his work on the 'War between Spain and England,' which was published in 1806, and contributed largely to turn European opinion in favour of England. His labours were suddenly and unpleasantly interrupted by the near approach of the French army.

'On the 7th of November Count Cobentzl revealed to me, with bitter tears, that it was time to leave Vienna. Count Fries, who had often stood my friend, and Fasbender, helped me to put my money matters in order so far as practicable, and on the evening of the 8th, at the same time with Fasbender, and in his carriage, I left Vienna, and on the 10th arrived with Paget and other fugitives at Brünn.'

The news of the battle of Austerlitz reached them at Troppau on the 4th of December, and they hurry off to Breslau; but on the 4th of January we find him at Dresden, contracting with a bookseller for the publication of the two books on which he was principally employed,—for that they did not absorb his whole time appears from a subsequent entry, to the effect that he had been working hard at his manuscripts and on memoirs for London.

'On the 8th of February,' he adds, 'at a dinner at Wynne's, the English Minister, we received the news of Pitt's death. Curious

that, notwithstanding my grief at this event, I did not regard the composition of the new (Fox-Grenville) ministry with unfavourable eyes; I rather promised myself great results from it.'

On the 16th of April he finished the introduction to his 'Fragments upon the Balance of Power in Europe,' and to his entire satisfaction:--

'This introduction, as regards power, fulness, and beauty of style, is indisputably the best piece on the larger scale that I have ever written for the public. I read at this time daily, and often many hours of the night, in the Bible, deeply captivated by this reading.'

To his biblical reading may be traced much of the high-wrought energy, the lofty spirit of self-sacrifice, the contempt for present evils, and the richness of imagery, which distinguished this production. It was undertaken to promote a hopeful enterprise; the completed parts of it were published to counteract the demoralising influences of ill success. Like the political tracts of Burke, it abounds in passages of universal and permanent application. Thus, in the supposed arguments of the *pocourante* German of 1806 we recognise the identical style of reasoning adopted by or for the *laissez-faire* Frenchman of 1862; by whom wealth and luxury, showy entertainments and new streets, are deemed an ample compensation for all that tends to raise men in the scale of thinking beings, that teaches self-government or inspires self-respect. The illustrious members of the 'ancient parties,' who are now living in forced inaction, may also take to themselves the noble appeal which Gentz addressed nearly half a century ago to his countrymen, ending—

'Your bare insulated existence is a perpetual terror to the oppressors, and for the oppressed an eternal consolation.'

This work was sent to Mackintosh, then at Bombay, with a letter describing the state of events after the peace of Presburg. The reply begins thus:—

'I received your letter of the 6th of May. I have read it fifty times since with the same sentiment which a Roman, at the extremity of Mauritania, would probably have felt if he had received an account of the ruin of his country, written the morning after the battle of Pharsalia, with all the unconquerable spirit of Cato, and the terrible energy of Tacitus. He would have exulted that there was something which Cæsar could not subdue, and from which a deliverer and an avenger might yet spring. . . I received by the same mail your two precious packets. I assent to all you say, sympathise with all you feel, and admire equally your reason and your eloquence throughout your masterly fragment.'

On the 7th of October Gentz wrote to von Hammer, the historian:—

'The question is no longer about certain provinces, nor the political equilibrium, but the individual safety of every one is at stake. You will know the sentence against Palm. Berthier says he has orders to shoot whoever should read writings such as those of Arndt, Gentz, &c. The internecine war against opinion, the extinction of thought, is in the Order of the day.'

In December, 1806, Palm, a bookseller of Nuremberg, was tried by a court-martial for exciting to insurrection by the circulation of libels against Napoleon, condemned, and shot. Gentz's last work was one of the alleged libels, and probably the most irritating; but the sentence was general, and he cannot be fairly charged with being even the innocent and unconscious cause of this atrocity.*

The book was also sent to Stadion and the Emperor, and called forth letters from each which determined him to return to Vienna. Shortly afterwards he received a letter from Prince Czartoryski with a ring (worth from 1200 to 1500 dollars) from the Emperor Alexander; a present which gratified him the less because he had just heard of the peace between France and Russia, the treaty of M. d'Oubril, which the Emperor subsequently refused to ratify. His retirement from the Prussian service had in no respect impaired his reputation or authority with Prussian princes and statesmen; and we find the most distinguished of them repairing to him for counsel and aid as soon as they had reason to anticipate a breach with France. Stein has long conferences with him; Prince Louis carries him off to a grand hunting party given by Prince Lobkowitz at Eisenberg, where the coming crisis is discussed; and on the 30th of September arrives General Phüll with a letter from Count Haugwitz, then at the head of affairs in Prussia, inviting him to the Prussian head-quarters at Naumburg. He arrived there on the 3rd of October, and formed part

* 'The pamphlet was entitled "*L'Allemagne dans son Abaissement*," and was attributed to the pen of M. Gentz. Palm was offered his pardon upon condition that he gave up the author of the work, which he refused to do.' (*Scott's Life of Napoleon*, ch. xxxiv. note.) All Gentz's tracts were avowed and notorious, and '*L'Allemagne*,' &c., was not by him. Sir Archibald Alison mentions the '*Fragments upon the Balance of Power*' as one of *two* specially inculcated.

An Irish landlord wrote to his agent: 'Tell my tenants that they will not frighten me by shooting you.' Authors appear to have held equally unfeeling language in 1806. At a dinner given by an eminent publisher, Thomas Campbell rose and, on the part of the authors present, proposed '*Napoleon Buonaparte*.' 'Why are we to drink his health?' asked the astonished host. 'Because he shot a bookseller.'

of the royal and ministerial suite till the 17th; a brief interval pregnant with momentous events, which he has minutely and scrupulously recorded in one of the most remarkable historical documents now extant.* It contains a complete exposure of the unparalleled folly, corruption, and incapacity of the Prussian ministers and generals, who managed to fix upon the very worst time for commencing hostilities, and the very worst mode of conducting them. As usual, Prussia missed her opportunity of throwing a decisive weight into the scale. She hesitated till the Austrians had been beaten at Austerlitz, and compelled to sign peace at Presburg; and then, with England alienated by her acceptance of Hanover, and Russia uncertain, she defied Napoleon, who made short work of her at Jena. Gentz's narrative leaves us in doubt whether her policy, if it merits the name, was owing to the King's weakness or the corruption of his advisers. Haugwitz laboured hard to prove that the war was rendered inevitable by the national feeling shared and encouraged by the Queen and Prince Louis, and that the ruinous delay was owing to the almost invincible repugnance of the King. The grand object was to reconcile the late subserviency to France with this sudden display of offended dignity; and for this purpose the first pen in Germany was to be secured. 'The object for which I wished to see you,' says Haugwitz to Gentz, 'is the most important it is possible to imagine; it is the interest and success of our enterprise. You cannot, must not quit us. Besides, I answer for everything. I know that they will be content at Vienna with what you will do here. Never will you have done a more essential service to the general cause. I will take care of your horses, of your lodging, of everything.'

The service for which he was especially wanted was to revise the King's letter to Napoleon and the War Manifesto, prepared by Lombard, who, with some difficulty, is persuaded to make important changes in both.

'When the task of revision was completed, Lombard told me that the King was extremely anxious for the publication of this manifesto; that he was unwilling to draw the sword without a declaration of the motives, and that I should do them a great service by hastening the translation as much as possible. I undertook it on my return to my lodgings, and, having devoted the whole night to it, finished it by eight in the morning (Oct. 7th). I saw this morning a number of

* 'Journal de ce qui m'est arrivé de plus marquant dans le Voyage que j'ai fait au Quartier-Général de S. M. le Roi de Prusse,' &c. It was not printed in a complete form till 1841.

persons, and especially a great number of officers of the royal suite. I can aver with perfect truth that every man I met in the streets addressed me with nearly the same compliment: "You are here. God be praised! This time, then, we shall not be deceived." On reflecting on all that was fatal in a situation where such guarantees were needed to calm distrust and fear, I began at the same time to suspect that the effect produced by my presence might well have been the principal motive in inviting me. Many things I have observed since have confirmed me in this opinion.

At all events, they were determined to get as much work as they could out of him: for the next day, after dinner, Haugwitz requested him, in the King's name, to draw up a proclamation to the army, on the object and character of the war; another addressed to the Prussian public in the same sense; and (what naturally struck him as odd) a prayer to be recited in the churches.

In noticing the letter, Napoleon spoke of it as a wretched pamphlet, such as England engaged hireling authors to compose at the rate of 500*l.* a year, adding, 'I am sorry for my brother, who does not understand the French language, and has certainly never read that rhapsody.' He also made light of the manifesto; but that a good deal of his indifference on this score was affected, is betrayed by the tone in which he assailed the reputed author in his bulletins. Edged in between bitter sarcasms levelled at the Queen, was a statement that public indignation is at its height against the authors of the war, especially Her Majesty and 'a wretched scribe named Gentz, one of those men without honour who sell themselves for money.'

He received no remuneration in any shape for his services on this occasion; and to be calumniated in such company was a distinction of which he had good reason to be proud. At the same time it was a serious matter for either man or woman to have this kind of mark set upon them.

Gibbon winds up the third chapter of his History with some striking reflections on the wide-spread and far-reaching tyranny of the Cæsars. 'To resist was fatal, and it was impossible to fly.' "Wherever you are," wrote Cicero to Marcellus, "remember that you are equally within the power of the conqueror." A similar train of reflection was suggested by the prostrate condition of the Continent when Napoleon's power was at its culminating point, and the selected objects of his vindictiveness, with the fate of the Duc d'Enghien before their eyes, were shunned or warned off by neutral or friendly territories, as the wounded stag is expelled or avoided by the herd. Madame de Staël had to make a long and perilous circuit

to reach a precarious resting-place*, and Gentz, a sworn servant of the House of Hapsburg, was told to keep aloof from their capital, for fear of compromising them:—

‘As they would not have me in Vienna, since Napoleon had assailed me in the most violent terms in his Berlin bulletins, I travelled on the 12th of November to Prague, and settled down in a wretched quarter there. I was so poor, that a loan of 400 paper florins from one Remboldt, Dietrichstein’s secretary, was of the greatest moment to me. What further was to become of me I knew not. Every journal brought the worst news of the progress of the French, the entire separation of England from the Continent,’ &c., &c.

This, if a strange, is by no means a dishonourable position for a man who had just been held up to public contempt by an emperor for selling his pen to princes; nor was he more than temporarily depressed by it.

‘I was, notwithstanding, almost always in the finest tone of mind; passed the livelong day in the best company; and at this very time awoke in me the last passion which has chained me to a woman. The Duchess of Acerenza, born Princess of Courland, was the object. This passion arose soon after my arrival in Prague, where I spent nearly every evening with the Princess, at the pleasantest house in the town. In the month of December it rose to a pitch of wildness of which my journal has retained the most remarkable traces in letters of fire. I wrote to Adam Müller: “The charms of this woman made me completely forget that there were a sun and stars beyond the heights round Prague.” Yet there was a certain independence and power in this with outward circumstances so strangely contrasting madness.’

Exciting times, stirring events, great risks run, and great things performed or attempted, warm the blood, kindle the imagination, increase sensibility, encourage enterprise, and breathe hope. Whatever the cause, the secret history of revolutionary times is full of passions, intrigues, and amatory adventures, which apparently absorb the thoughts and interests of the self-same actors and actresses who are simultaneously playing the leading parts in courts and camps before the world:—

‘Pour mériter vos charmes, pour plaire à vos beaux yeux,
J’ai fait la guerre aux rois, je l’aurois faite aux Dieux.’

* ‘Certes, on ne pouvait s’empêcher de le penser, l’Europe, jadis si facilement ouverte à tous les voyageurs, est devenue sous l’influence de l’Empereur Napoléon comme un grand filet qui vous enlance à chaque pas. . . . La géographie de l’Europe, telle que Napoléon l’a faite, s’apprend que trop bien par le malheur. Les détours qu’il fallait prendre pour éviter sa puissance étaient déjà près de deux mille lieues; et maintenant en partant de Vienne même, j’étais réduite à emprunter le territoire asiatique pour y échapper.’ (*Dix Ans d’Exil.*)

All revolutionary periods, more or less, resemble the Fronde in this respect; and there is truth in the concluding remark of Gentz, that the capacity for a concentration of feeling in agitating and distracting circumstances shows power.

'1807.—The beginning of this year was distinguished by my mad passion for Joanna of Courland. It was first, after a short duration, interrupted by an adventurous journey to Nachod, where I on my own fist (*auf eigene Faust*) treated with Count Götzen for the provisional occupation of the Prusso-Silesian fortresses by Austrian troops. (This occurred from the 10th to the 17th of January.) On my return, I found all changed; Wallmoden in possession; my folly rewarded as it deserved. Still the oscillations of the passions lasted far into March, when (with Mohrenheim's help) they finally ceased. The descriptions are curious, but could not be preserved.'

About this time he received 500 louis from Sir R. Adair, the English Minister at Vienna, and, 'rather unexpectedly, 500 ducats, 'with a ring in brilliants worth 400, from Prince Czartoryski,' on the part of Russia. In June, another 500 louis from England, and in July we find him with horses, carriages, and cook, sunk in endless enjoyments and frivolities with the Princess Bagration, the Duchess of Weimar, the Duke of Coburg, and the whole fine world of Carlsbad, where the news of the Treaty of Tilsit had just arrived. But with him dissipation never implies idleness. He is constantly occupied with what he calls the higher politics, although in the spring he complains that they were slippery ground for him. He did not wish to break with Russia: he could not break with Austria; and both, owing to the 'mis-screwed' condition of the world, were on warlike terms with England. He, however, wrote and addressed to Canning a strong memoir on the Russian war-manifesto, which he had cause to believe was well received; and in May, 1808, the Duke of Portland, his particular friend, being then at the head of the ministry, a considerable credit was opened to him in England, which at once relieved him from all pressing cares. He then goes to Toplitz, intending to spend the summer there:—

'There I immediately made the acquaintance of Madame de Staël, who was travelling in North Germany with August Wilhelm Schlegel and Sismondi; and, few other visitors having arrived, I passed several remarkable days with her, accompanied her to Pirna, — for I dared not enter Dresden, — and suffered myself to be deeply fascinated by her clever flatteries, which at length assumed a really passionate character, and awoke the jealousy of her two companions. She wrote to Vienna, where she had passed the winter, that I was the first man of Germany.'

Without fully meriting the unkind insinuation levelled at her by Canning in the 'Anti-Jacobin,' as

'Staël, the Epicene !

Bright o'er whose flaming cheek and purple nose
The bloom of young desire unceasing glows,'

Madame de Staël was quite as 'anxious to please as a woman as a wit, and in her advances to celebrated men with a turn for gallantry, did not leave the impression that her speculations on the passions, were limited to the Platonic theory. Gentz's political celebrity and social successes, his glow and flow of mind, his lofty defiance of their common foe, and his professed admiration for her genius, were sure to captivate her; nor was it at all surprising that her learned companions were thrown into the shade. She partly agreed with Byron:—

'I hate your authors, who 're all author,—fellows
In foolscap uniform turned up with ink.'

Schlegel, although the vainest of mortals, was trained to drop into the background when she was amusing herself in this fashion, and, much to his disgust, was universally regarded as the original of the humble friend and complacent admirer in 'Corinne.' In a letter to Rahel, June, 1814, Gentz makes a most ungrateful return for Madame de Staël's flattering attentions, and speaks slightly of the political part of her book on Germany, of which no one was better qualified to judge:—

'It contains some remarkable and admirably-written chapters on German literature. All the rest is dished-up rubbish. What does so disgusting an egotist, who refers everything to *les peines de cœur*, that is, to the wretched history of her (deservedly) unsuccessful love-trials—what does or can she know about nations, or, for that matter, about individuals, when it is not revealed to her as in these chapters by a sort of inspiration? She set to once, and in right earnest, making love to me: it was in 1808. Out of mere vanity, I then compelled myself to cultivate her. She subsequently became unbearable to me. In 1813, she wrote me some foolish and withal insolent letters from Stockholm, of a political cast. I answered her coldly and slightly. Thereupon she got wild, and has since talked of me in England as one who deserved worse than hanging. A certain power of execution cannot be denied to this lady: were she other than she is, and knew how to write so, she might become great. But since no one, even with the highest so-called talent, can express anything greater than is in him, in her best compositions she produces only emphatic chatter. I regard Châteaubriand as the manikin of her species.'

If, as is generally supposed, she was the heroine of Benjamin Constant's 'Adolphe,' she was not easily rebuffed or wearied

out; and we find her again inviting the attentions of Gentz in 1815:—

‘It is very kind of you to promise me a day to compensate me for that which deprives me of the Duke of Wellington. Would Friday suit you? and will you be so kind as to inform M. de Humboldt of your decision? We should be too numerous, if I brought together all those of my friends who are ambitious to make your acquaintance; and you will prefer conversing *en petit comité*.’

On the 18th of February, 1809, Gentz received a letter from Count Stadion recalling him to Vienna. He arrived there on the 21st, and the same evening had a long conference with the minister. The war was decided, and he was immediately set to work on the manifesto, which was completed on the 30th of March, and warmly commended. The same day he began the translation of it into French. The Austrians had their usual luck; on the 13th of May their capital was again occupied by the French; and Gentz was once more a fugitive in strangely mixed, highly distinguished, and extremely interesting society, by which he was courted and flattered to the top of his bent. From his notes of what passed at head-quarters and about the Court, it would appear that the person chiefly to blame for this renewed catastrophe was the Emperor (Francis I. of Austria), who was constantly imposing his confined views and obstinate will on his counsellors, no matter what their standing, reputation, or apparent independence of control. It has been truly and pointedly remarked, that during his long reign—from 1792 to 1835—he was what George III. would have been without a parliament. Stadion complained to Gentz in the bitterest terms of the manner in which he had been forced to act against his confirmed convictions, and then made responsible for the very policy he had deprecated. Whilst the question of the continuation of the war was still pending, he refused to be compromised any further, and (September 26th) handed over the portfolio of foreign affairs to Metternich, who remarked on accepting it: ‘This is the third time we make peace in the midst of a ministerial interregnum, whilst Bonaparte changes neither system nor instruments, and pursues his course without a jar.’ A day or two before, Gentz wrote to a correspondent:—

‘If you ask me who is minister for foreign affairs, I should be puzzled to tell you, though I pass my life with the two men between whom he must be sought. There are moments when one would be thought to be; moments when the other; moments when neither; moments, again, when both; moments, lastly, when nobody. This is the exact truth. Neither Metternich nor Stadion knows who has actually drawn up the credentials of Lichtenstein!’

The scene of these events was Dotis; and great allowance must be made for the terrible position of the Imperial family, stunned and confounded by disaster and defeat. Till compelled to take part in their distracted counsels, Gentz bore his exile philosophically enough. At Havart, in Hungary, a wretched place, which he thought safer than Buda or Pesth, he says:—‘I lived almost exclusively with Sallust, Tacitus, Seneca, and Lucretius. By accident, the posthumous historical work of Fox fell in my way, which I read and commented with great indignation.’ There also he began a translation of Burke’s ‘Letters on a Regicide Peace.’

At a long subsequent period, when the Emperor Francis, who never much liked Gentz, was induced by a sense of his services to offer him a higher title, he refused, saying, he was content to be called the friend of Metternich. It is, therefore, curious to mark from what slender, and even adverse, beginnings this prized and cherished friendship sprang. When Metternich’s appointment was confirmed, Gentz resolved to leave Dotis, saying:—

‘I shall never pardon him the indifference and levity with which he sees Count Stadion depart, and the confidence, truly shocking, with which he undertakes so terrible a task as that of the direction of affairs at this moment. I will not even nourish the suspicion that he has contributed in any manner to this scandalous reverse of Stadion: his ostensible conduct is enough.’

He afterwards fully acquits Metternich of this imputation, which was clearly unfounded; nor does any ground appear for the Prince’s refusal which would not have been equally applicable to any other attached servant of the monarchy. Gentz’s opinion becomes more favourable on hearing Metternich’s own defence of his conduct, and he comes round altogether after a long conversation on finance:—

‘He (M.) is decidedly opposed to the idea of meddling with ecclesiastical property. He has developed to me in this respect very sound and very respectable principles* he is persuaded that all the moral strength of the Austrian monarchy is to be found in its being regarded by the world as the centre and rallying point of all that is left of ancient principles, of ancient forms, of ancient sentiments; and that it is this idea which, so long as it can be maintained, will always give a large number of powerful allies to Austria. This conversation has entirely reconciled me to Metternich, against whom I had great complaints at the epoch of the peace.’

It is certainly a plausible defence of the reactionary policy for which Metternich, justly or unjustly, has been made responsible. ‘It is not possible,’ remarks Gentz, soon afterwards,

‘that the defects of his character should altogether spoil the just and wise views with which he starts for Paris.’ In summing up the constitution and prospects of the government at the end of 1810, he says:—

‘Foreign affairs are not absolutely bad in the hands of Metternich. He thinks himself fortunate; this is an excellent quality. He has resources; he has *savoir-faire*; he does not spare himself personally. But he is light, dissipated, and presumptuous. If his star seconds him during some years, he can take and give the state a very suitable position. But beware of new crises. They will overthrow him.’

On the 23rd of June, 1810, Gentz records, with allowable complacency, his reception at Tüplitz by the Empress, the Emperor’s third wife, who, amongst other flattering speeches, said, speaking of Goethe, of whom she had just before seen a good deal at Carlsbad, ‘It is not given to all to write like you, and to be able to talk so clearly and naturally with every one.’

In the following August arrives the Princess of Solms, afterwards Duchess of Cumberland, to my taste, the most beautiful woman my eyes ever alighted on, in everybody’s opinion one of the most amiable. She was now the sun towards which my gaze was directed. . . . To this day (after sixteen years) my soul swells when I think of this duchess, and the goodwill with which she rewarded my honest homage I still reckon as one of the fairest adornments of my life.’

Currency and maritime laws were the subjects, uncongenial as they may be thought, with which he occupied the hours not devoted to high-born beauty; and he treated both in a manner to command great weight and attention, if not universal approval, for his views. He drew up several papers on finance for the English ministry, who, considering probably that whatever they paid for was their own, quietly took credit for his reasonings and researches. Not so the Austrian financiers, who openly consulted him as the highest authority in this branch of domestic policy, and, so far as the pecuniary embarrassments of the empire permitted, attempted to carry out his principles.

We now pass on to the autumn of 1813, to the eve of one of those emergencies which invariably summoned Gentz from the library or the drawing-room, like Cincinnatus from the plough. War was in the wind; and he was wanted for the manifesto, which, having had early notice from Metternich of the probability of its being needed, he had completed on the 11th of August, war having been declared on the 10th, at midnight. It was read over and settled on the very evening of its completion, and published on the 17th. In token of the general approval, the Emperor Alexander, who arrived at Prague on

the 15th, presented him with a diamond ring, the fourth or fifth he had received from the Russian Emperor, who had a peculiar fancy for giving rings. Here he breaks out in a strain which contrasts strikingly with his review of his position at Vienna in 1811, when, partly owing to ill-health, and partly to the marriage of Maria Louisa to Napoleon, he was sunk in the lowest depths of despondency:—

‘My position in Prague was one of the pleasantest and most interesting imaginable. I was now for several months the medium of all-important political relations between Vienna and head-quarters, the channel of all authentic news, the middle point of all diplomatists and all diplomacy. All went as I could wish: my health had become excellent, my name great. I had more money than enough.’

On the 22nd of September, the news of the battle of Leipsic, which had reached Prague ten days before, was confirmed, and Gentz had the pleasing duty of ordering the illumination of the town, and the celebration of the *Te Deum*, according to the laudable practice of Christian and Catholic conquerors:—

‘It was a glorious moment for me. That for which I had fought for twenty years seemed at last to get the upper hand. Circumstances made me one of the first organs which announced this great reverse of fortune; and the fall of the sovereignty of the world, and of the man who stood at its head, was for me, if not for every one, a pure triumph, disturbed by no retrospect, since I had not only never wavered in my principles and sentiments, but had drawn upon myself the personal hatred of Napoleon.’

In the joy of his heart, he goes on to expatiate on the merits of the various members of his establishment, especially on those of the French cook, Bastien, who accompanied him everywhere.

But we must pass on at once to the Congress of Vienna in 1814, where all the potentates and master-spirits of the victorious side were congregated in one moving and glittering mass, and where everything of importance passed through his hands or under his immediate notice. The first complete conference was attended by the plenipotentiaries of Austria, Prussia, England, France, Spain, Portugal, Sweden, and Russia. Whilst Gentz was amusing himself at a *soirée* at Madame Nesselrode's, Nesselrode came in, and told him that they had elected him their First Secretary, by acclamation. He had already been employed to draw up a declaration for the four great Powers, England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia; and he now took an active share in their deliberations, besides discharging the proper duties of his post. It seems, also, to have been an understood thing that he should act as penman to any of them who had any

proposition to make or line of policy to urge; the *grands seigneurs* of the period not being, perhaps luckily for some of them, so ready with the pen as their successors. Thus he was at work on a discourse to be addressed by Count Herberstein to Stadion, on introducing him to the Council. Stadion hearing of it, writes him a *joli billet*, requesting to see it, and begs him to compose the reply, which he does. Besides writing a paper on the slave-trade for Castlereagh, he translates his lordship's letter on the affair of Saxony into French, and gives a memorable proof of his independence by openly supporting it against his chief patron:—

'February 12th.—At nine o'clock with Metternich. In translating Castlereagh's letter I felt my ideas cleared and strengthened. At four at Talleyrand's. Conversation in which he does me the most signal justice. Dined at Metternich's with Wassenberg. After dinner, between seven and eight in the evening, I bring on the most important discussion on Castlereagh's letter, and hold to Metternich (with Wessenberg for witness) the most energetic language he ever heard from me. This day is one of the most marking (*marquans*) in the history of my public life: it will be perhaps *le plus beau* of my life.'

Besides doing him signal justice in words, which cost the speaker nothing, Talleyrand, before the Congress broke up, presented him with 22,000 florins, in the name of Louis XVIII., which is duly entered as a 'magnificent' donation.

Numerous entries give evidence of the female influence to which allusion has been made, and the manner in which the public interests were intermingled with private by the select few who had charged themselves with the resettlement of Europe:—

'September 12th. — Went to Prince Metternich; long conversation with him, not (unhappily) on public affairs, but on his and my relations with Madame de Sagan.

This lady pushed the liberty or license of divorce to such an extreme as to be able to play at whist with three ex-husbands, whilst a fourth betted on her. In allusion to her practice of pensioning them off, it was said, '*Elle se ruine en maris.*'

It would seem that she inclined to the doctrine of a plurality of admirers, as well as a quick succession of husbands. Two days after the discussion of Castlereagh's letter, we find:—

'14th.—Returned to Metternich; conversation with him—alas! on the unhappy *liaison* with *la* Windischgrütz, which appears to interest him still more than the affairs of the world.

'22nd.—Dined with Metternich at Nesselrode's. M. informs me of

his definitive rupture with the Duchess, which is at present an event of the first order.'

Here follows a specimen of a busy if not exactly well-spent day of rest:—

'*Sunday, Nov. 6th.*—Went out at ten. Conversations of different kinds with Metternich. Returned at midday. Count Clam, long talk with him on his new passion for Dorothée (Madame de Périgord). Visit of the Duc de Campo Chiaro, and sustained conversation with him. At four at the Princess Bagration's; very remarkable conversation with the Emperor of Russia, his projects, his conduct, &c. Dined at Metternich's with Wenzel, Lichtenstein, Bindeř, Neumann, &c. Long conversation with him on his affairs of the heart. At eight at Nesselrode's; M. de Stein, who is cold to me; the famous General Laharpe, who, in a conversation with Pozzo and me, betrays his bad principles without reserve. Returned home at half-past ten, and worked at a despatch for Bukarest.'

'*Friday, 11th.*—Visit to the King of Denmark—talked an hour with him. Then Metternich; long conversation, constantly turning more on the confounded women than on business.

'*13th.*—Went out at eleven. At Metternich's. Returned. At half-past one at Talleyrand's. From three to four, curious conversation with the Duchess of Sagan on her fatal history with Metternich. Dined at Count Bernstorff's. Clam with me. At eight, general conference at Metternich's. Fate of Genoa decided. Returned at eleven, and worked at the *procès-verbal* till two in the morning.'

The picture would be incomplete without a practical joke or two, to lighten the labours of the plenipotentiaries. At a dinner at the Duchess's, the conversation, 'very free,' turned on the demoiselles H.; and the merriment was much enhanced on learning, after the departure of one of the party, Count Coronini, that he was engaged to one of them. In the course of the evening, Gentz received a written challenge, as from the Count, to fight the next day. The forgery, though suspected, was not discovered until the following morning, and Gentz's irritation was increased by a heavy loss the same evening at play.

In the summary of the year he states that his extraordinary receipts in the course of it had amounted to at least 17,000 ducats, besides his regular official income of about 9,000 florins, and the profits of his agency for Wallachia, obtained for him by Metternich in 1813.

The rest of the published diaries includes only portions of four months in 1819, July, August, September, and December; very important months for Germany and Gentz's reputation, however, since the Carlsbad Congress dates from them, and attempts have been made to fasten on

him the responsibility of its most unpopular resolutions. A spirited defence has been published by Joseph Gentz, a relative; but it was needless, for no one now doubts that Gentz acted conscientiously, in strict accordance with his avowed and confirmed principles. If there was a man in the world whom he revered more than another, whose good opinion he was most anxious to secure, it was Adam Müller, with whom he was in daily, almost hourly, communication whilst he was employed on the famous thirteenth article of the *Bundessact*. The controversy raised by it could not be made intelligible to English readers without digressing widely into fields where they would be loth to follow; and we can take only a cursory glance at the rest of Gentz's public or political career, although his energy and industry never flagged, and independently of his unpublished official labours, we could point to printed papers from his pen on every prominent question of European interest from 1819 till 1832. How he continued to be regarded by contemporaries, we learn from such indications as a passage in Châteaubriand's 'Congrès de Vérone,' who states that, on accepting the portfolio of foreign affairs in 1822, besides the usual letters to foreign ministers, he addressed 'un *mot particulier*' to M. Gentz, knowing his influence with Metternich, and knowing also that the principal '*contrariété*' would come from the Cabinet of Vienna. This *mot particulier* begins:—'Me voilà ministre, Monsieur. M. le Prince de Metternich vous communiquera peut-être la lettre où j'ai l'honneur de lui mander tout le détail. Maintenant ne m'abandonnez pas: je suis sur la brèche.'

Gentz was assailed as reactionary, and he was so in one sense; for from the time when (to borrow the beautiful metaphor of Canning) 'the spires and turrets of ancient establishments began to reappear above the subsiding wave,' he was tremblingly alive to signs in the political horizon which threatened a return of the deluge. The French Revolution of 1830 startled him; but he was amongst the first to deprecate a recurrence to the fatal course pursued by Germany in 1793, and to point out that there was nothing menacing to the peace of the world in the change of dynasty in France.

His multifarious correspondence also bears testimony to his large views, as well as to his vast knowledge, especially his letters to Adam Müller. Persons of distinction, from all quarters of the world, press eagerly for his opinion on the subjects which interested them. Thus, the late Earl Stanhope, a very clever and accomplished nobleman, keeps him fully informed, at intervals from 1825 to 1828, of the changes in the

English ministry as well as the leading measures before Parliament, and earnestly presses for his advice.* Goethe begs him to employ his influence with his powerful friends to forward a literary object, and gracefully recalls the period when they 'conversed in the most cultivated society on the affairs of the heart and mind.' Alexander and William Humboldt write frequently. But space compels us to confine ourselves to the correspondence with Rahel, in which Gentz pours out his whole soul with the openness and felicity of expression which are traditionally stated to have made him so fascinating a talker.

The handwriting of Varnhagen, her husband, was the clearest and neatest ever seen, not excepting Porson's or Mrs. Piozzi's. Hers was all but illegible; and we note the fact for the benefit of those who attach importance to penmanship as an indication of character. 'Since I often read your letter of March,' writes Gentz, 'I have copied it, to get over the torment of your bad handwriting, and preserve the enjoyment unimpaired: I now copy all your letters.' Yet they were not love-letters; at least not what Germans call love-letters; for they might pass for such in most other countries, and may be compared in this respect to a celebrated poem, by a gifted lady, beginning, 'I cannot love thee,' and containing some tolerably significant assurances that she could. On the 21st of September, 1810, he writes:—

'It has really been an endless mistake,—shall I say of ours or Nature's?—that we never arrived at love for each other, — I mean to ordinary complete love. A relation would have burst forth between us, the like of which the world has had but few. Instead of this, we have both of us wasted our best on *folk* (Leute), as you distinguish this class; and are, each in a way, impoverished. You stood higher, saw more freely and farther, than I.'

Then, with a rare frankness and self-knowledge, he goes on to attribute his constant slowness or incapacity to seize the goods the Gods provided him to 'the meanest of all human knaveries, namely, vanity, the stupid striving for appearances, which cheats us out of all true enjoyment, out of the entire genuine reality of life.' We shall presently find Rahel valuing Gentz for his child-like betrayal of this weakness, as when he writes: 'Now I beg of you, love, to write soon again, and soon again to flatter me in your heavenly way. Your flatteries are a true voluptuous soul-bath, out of which one comes refreshed and strengthened.' Most

* Lord Stanhope's letters are written in German, and begin 'My dear and honoured friend.' The completest collection of Gentz's fugitive writings we are acquainted with, was made by his Lordship, and is now in the library at Chevening.

people would expect him to come out enervated; yet there are women who by applauding what is public-spirited, by sympathising with what is noble and elevating, really brace the nerves of the author, the artist, the orator, the statesman, the patriot, or the philanthropist, for his allotted task. At all events the taste for flattery from female lips is not a very uncommon or a very culpable one: '*Vous flattez, coquine, mais n'importe; flattez toujours; c'est bien séduisant.*' Gentz, too, was all made up of sensibility and nervousness—a complete conductor of electricity, as he says somewhere—an Eolian harp, which trembled at every passing breeze; and much of the fancy and feeling that light and warm his style may be traced to his susceptibility to temporary impressions:

'They were but the wind passing carelessly over,
And all the wild sweetness they waked was his own.'

'*Des fleurs et des livres, voilà tout ce qu'il faut à ma vie,*' exclaims Madame de Roland, who, if she was not much belied, required a few accessories. But Gentz, in failing health, found his chief solace in books and flowers. The date of one of his letters runs thus:—

'Weinhaus, a quarter of an hour from Vienna, the 28th of September, 1825. In a room before a large plate-glass window, through which I overlook my little garden, or rather my great bouquet of flowers, as set in a frame, in a clear dark-blue sky, and with sixteen degrees of heat. As if you saw it; is it not?'

Gentz complains that through his brain, through his life, have passed too many events, thoughts, combinations, works, men, destinies, for the memory to grapple with, or for him to dwell with pleasure on the past. 'I am, and I was at all times, condemned to the Present; and although all passions, nay, to a certain degree, all unrest of desire and enjoyment has subsided in me, yet the charm of the Present is still too strong.' Just after Kotzebue had been stabbed by Sand, Gentz received a threatening letter, stating that as he was not worthy of dying by the dagger, poison had been destined and prepared for him; that he had long been condemned as a traitor who had undermined the freedom of his country. This letter had a terrible effect on him. He excused himself from dining with a foreign ambassador, his assured friend, and for a week together did not venture to leave the house, and hardly to eat. Varnhagen, who speaks of the letter as a hoax, cites the alarm felt by the victim as a proof of his nervousness at the approach of danger or the thought of pain; but men of his temperament are not necessarily wanting in firmness or courage, and no

womanly fear was betrayed by Gentz when he passed through the outposts of hostile armies to beard Napoleon in his pride.

He was above the middle height, and his features indicated decision and self-confidence. He was frank to the verge of imprudence, and could not dissemble or dissimulate, if he would. Whenever he tried to adopt the diplomatic manner, he failed so egregiously that a foreign minister (Sir Arthur Paget, we believe,) said he could always tell at a glance when Gentz wanted to delude or work upon him; for there was invariably the same stolen sidelong of inquiry and doubt. He commonly gave up all attempt at reserve or concealment with a laugh.

Few in declining years would be ready, with Fénelon, to live their lives over again precisely as they had lived them. Many, after playing 'no unnoticed part,' would exclaim with James Smith —

'Would I resume it? Oh! no —

Four acts are done — the jest grows stale,

The waning lamps burn dim and pale,

And reason asks *cui bono?*'

But a large number, perhaps the majority, would leap at the proposal to have back their youth, with its wild freshness and its buoyancy, if they might retain the dear-bought lessons of experience. This boon, this blessing (if it be one), was virtually vouchsafed to Gentz, who, in his sixty-fifth year, was suddenly restored, as if by immersion in Medea's caldron instead of the baths of Gastein, to exuberant health and vigour — moral, mental, and physical — of mind, of body, and of heart. The miracle — for it sounds like one — with its memorable effects, had best be read in his own glowing language. In a letter to Rahel, 22nd of September, 1830, after apologising for a 'long, 'very long' silence, he continues: —

'The first commencement of this happy revolution arose out of the circumstance that my health, which for fifteen years had suffered grievously — not so much by special attacks of illness, as by incessant discomfort with the gout — has, during the last two years, experienced a regeneration little short of miraculous. I feel myself at present thoroughly well, and have a keen sense of well-being, such as I scarcely experienced even during the best years of my life. One consequence of this, amongst others, was, that not only has my mind regained its entire youthful freshness, and my heart its full early susceptibility, but also that my person has become strikingly *rajeuni*, and all my bodily faculties are again at my disposal. At my time of life, it is almost ludicrous to speak in such terms of myself; but, as I can make the communication with perfect truth, since it is made to me every day and from every side by others, why should I withhold from you, my sympathising friend, the satisfaction of hearing it from

myself? I could produce to you, in support of it, testimonies from persons who have not seen me for some time, which would leave no doubt at all on your mind. My apprehension of death, which is well known to you, is on this account, though not altogether effaced, yet still so much cast in the shade that it seldom assails me; and I already begin tacitly to reckon upon attaining at least the extraordinary age of Bonstetten.

• You will now be somewhat prepared to understand what follows.

• Along with my returning health, I have thrown myself once more into the world and into social life, which I had for many years renounced. The satisfaction with which I was everywhere received, proved to me that I could still very well maintain my place in this circle. My increasing repugnance to public business,—though I have never for an instant ceased to attend to it conscientiously,—my growing fear of solitary study, which always presented to me nothing but melancholy conclusions,—have contributed, each in its way, to this change in my manner of living. I attached myself chiefly to the society of women, who have always been agreeable to me, and who are at the present day far above men—much more than they were twenty-five or thirty years ago. I made my court (as people call it) to some of them, and procured for myself in this way particular interests amongst the general range of society. That I could ever again be in love, I regarded as a thing impossible, though I nevertheless felt that, to enjoy in perfection my renewed and regenerated existence, I ought to arrive once more even at this extreme limit. My presentiment has been realised in a most unexpected way. To you I must and I dare confess, what towards others I content myself with not formally denying, that since last winter I have borne in my bosom a passion of greater strength than any which I ever felt during my earlier life—that this passion was indeed accidental in its origin, but that I have since intentionally fostered and cherished it.

• You will be astonished—perhaps horror-struck—when I tell you that the object of this passion is a girl of nineteen years of age, and, what is more, a *dansuse*. I require all my confidence, not merely in your good nature, but in your liberality (in the old and lofty sense of that word), in your exalted views, so much above all that is commonplace—in your enlarged range of thought—in your tolerance—I require all this to obviate the apprehension that you will at once condemn me upon my own confession, without grace or mercy.

• Yet when I assure you that the intercourse with this girl has poured out upon me a fulness of felicity such as I have never known or felt before,—that this intercourse has been to me not only the counterpoise of numerous anxieties under which otherwise I should have infallibly succumbed, but also the upholding principle of my cheerfulness of spirits, my health, and my life—I think you will be inclined not only to excuse me, but also to admit, with your usual enlightened candour, that the person who could thus work upon me, besides the unbounded beauty by which she enchains me, must also possess other qualities which account for a relation such as I have depicted.

'This person is now in Berlin. If on other accounts you happen still to concern yourself about the Theatre, you will probably hear of her; but *I* feel anxious that you should *see* her once or twice, if it be only upon the stage. I know from other evidences that you set a high value upon the external appearance of people, and you are right in doing so. I am therefore anything rather than indifferent to the impression which this Fanny may make upon you; and I entreat you to take an opportunity of writing to me upon the subject.

'Together with the sensibility to social amusements, to feminine beauty, to love,—I still tremble when I speak the word aloud, even before *you*,—there has been newly revived in me the sensibility to poetry. I avail myself of every leisure hour to read poetry—ancient and modern—Latin, German, Italian, French. How far I have gone in this favourite occupation, you shall judge by one example, the particular circumstances of which cannot be without interest for you.'

After mentioning how Heine's poems had fallen in his way and fascinated him, he proceeds:—

'At this moment I marvel at the courage which it has required to lay before you such a train of thoroughly unexpected confessions,—to tell you that I feel myself *rajeuni*,—that I am in love,—that I adore a *danseuse*,—and that I sympathise with Heine! You are, however, the only person in the world with whom I could hazard such avowals, nor could I even have hazarded them with you, unless this letter were going by an Austrian courier to Berlin. Almost every matter which it contains could only be written in the strictest confidence; but I was for a long time accustomed to think with you, to feel with you, and never to veil from you even my most hidden weaknesses. If you, on your side, have remained *the same*,—and how can I possibly doubt it,—reward my confidence with a letter in the old well-known style, friendly or reproachful, as you please. Acquaint me at the same time how matters go on with you, with your health and temper, with your temporal and eternal well-being. We two ought never to separate as long as we breathe. Pray chime in with this sentiment, and appease speedily the longing of your faithful friend,

GENIZ.'

Opera-goers of mature years will not need to be told who this wonder-working Fanny was, but a few details relating to her may be welcome to a younger generation. The Opera at Vienna is small, and hardly worthy of the Austrian capital; but it enjoys a high authority in the musical world, and the ballet is conducted upon a scale that enables it to rival those of Paris and Naples. In 1828–29, the leading *danseuses* were Fanny and Thérèse Elslér, sisters, and natives of Vienna. Their father had been a familiar attendant for many years on the great composer, Joseph Haydn, who left him a considerable legacy, which, from no fault of his, was soon reduced to little or nothing. Of their mother we know nothing, except that, bred up in thea-

trical company of the lower sort, she had no scruple in agreeing with her husband to turn their daughters' personal attractions and accomplishments to the best account. Barbaja, the director of the Opera at Naples, engaged them for the San Carlos Theatre when mere children, and being also director of the Court Theatre of Vienna, brought them out at it so soon as he thought them sufficiently advanced to be produced with effect. They created a sensation; their reputation soon became European; and Fanny's style of dancing, independently of her exceeding loveliness, was exactly adapted to attract admirers of cultivated taste. 'Poetry put in action' was not too complimentary a phrase. The Duke de Reichstadt fell desperately in love with her, and might be seen day after day walking up and down near her lodgings, in the hope of a chance such as befell Faust with Margaret; but he was disappointed, and, although rumour has connected her with his premature death, they never met in private at all.

Gentz was simultaneously struck, and eagerly sought an introduction, which was by no means so easy as may be thought. There was, indeed, no 'mother of the maids' to watch over the morals of the 'corps de ballet,' but the theatres were under the guardianship of a public officer, the Count de Gallenberg, who was in the habit of inviting to his house the performers, male and female, who stood highest in public esteem; and it was perfectly understood that any acquaintance beyond their own circle must originate with him. For some time the Count refused to introduce Gentz, either to tantalise him, or to save him from the apprehended folly; but the envied privilege was at last granted, and so assiduously followed up that he at length obtained exclusive possession of the prize. He was reputed rich on the strength of his prodigal expenditure; he was celebrated; he was the familiar companion of the great; and there were other reasons why the mother gave him the preference over younger rivals — for he certainly owed his success, in the first instance, to the shameless venality of the mother — and the poor girl resigned herself to her destiny with a sigh. How he gradually won upon her may be collected from his letters; and the enduring attachment she eventually contracted for him, when the tie was once formed, does credit to her understanding and her heart.

Two years before, in reference to Rahel's recommendation of some verses in the '*Courrier Français*,' he said that he had left off reading verses for many years, always excepting Virgil, Horace, and Lucan; that the only French poet he could still endure was Racine; and that looking for verses in a French newspaper

would be to him like taking a stroll into a pesthouse. His sudden taste for Heine's 'Buch der Lieder,' therefore, is not the least striking feature of the transformation.

The subject of his love is resumed, after the lapse of a month, with the same vividness and intensity which render us loth to abridge the letters relating to it. They form, in fact, the very keystone of the character, and contain many striking passages unconnected with his passion. But we can only find room for two or three more:—

Frisburg, October 18, 1830.

'The best instructed among the ordinary people around me think and affirm (for my connexion with her is the subject of endless talk in the society here, where I am in great favour) that I have conquered her only by what is called my *eloquence*. This of itself would be singular enough; but still it is very far from being the truth. I have gained her singly and exclusively by the magical power of *my love*. When she first knew me, she neither knew nor even conceived that there existed anywhere *such a love*, and a hundred times over she has confessed to me that I had unfolded to her a new world by the manner in which I behaved to her from the very first moment, and still further by the revelation of a love the possibility of which she had never dreamt of, and which is, I must own, neither frequent nor common. Here alone lies the whole key of the phenomenon. You will understand, as a matter of course, that I never was silly enough to expect from her a return of passion, in the narrower sense of the word. I never imagined that she could "fall in love" with me, for even in the full fervour of passion my reason does not abandon me. It was enough for me to inspire her with a sentiment floating between friendship, gratitude, and love: and I did in fact succeed—for men succeed in everything which they struggle for with complete energy and genuine perseverance—in so planting and confirming this feeling in her mind, that it by degrees filled her whole soul, and at this moment, unless all the evidences deceive me, it cannot be supplanted or overcome by any other feeling whatever.

'Now imagine what it is, at my time of life and with my few remaining pretensions, to see a passion like mine thus rewarded? Imagine *la satisfaction de l'amour propre*, from which no human being can disengage himself, and least of all one who takes as much pleasure in flattery as you and I do; imagine the blessedness of daily, undisturbed intercourse with a person in whom everything ravishes me,—who does not require, in order to produce this effect, "to rise like a complete Venus out of the sea," as you express it in a divine phrase of your letter, which I thoroughly comprehend—in whose eyes, in whose hands (do you only look at them!), in whose single and separate charms, my mind can absorb itself for hours together—whose voice tells upon me like magic—and with whom I carry on endless conversations which would often astound you, as I should do with the most docile school-girl: for I educate her with paternal care, and she is at once my beloved mistress and my faithful child. Imagine

this rich stock of enjoyments, and in addition to it all, so much more which no tongue can tell, and it will be easy for you with a heart as comprehensive as yours to understand completely that which to others may still appear foolishness. . . .

'I set a proper value upon your diplomatic talent, but I must at the same time acquaint you, that in this case it was hardly required. The nature of my connexion with Fanny is so little a secret at Vienna that it is talked of every day; and what contributes not a little to my comfort is, that those persons for whose opinion I care the most—amongst others Prince Metternich—never treat the matter with any other feeling than that of kindness and delicacy. There will be no *war* therefore on this account.'

Mixed up with passionate professions and glowing pictures of happiness, we find a curious piece of self-criticism, or rather self-laudation:—

'Really I am not blinded by vanity upon this occasion. I have entirely forgotten that I ever was an author; and for the last twenty years I have not looked at a line of my printed works, the "Protocols of Congress" excepted. A little while ago, a man, who reads very well, read to me aloud the preface of a certain book, on the "Political Balance;" and I was altogether astonished that I could ever have written so well. Pray read this preface once over, only for a joke, and then tell me yourself whether that was not something like a style. Schlegel has written but few pages which in point of style will bear comparison with it.'

This again recalls the Dean of St. Patrick's, who, as Scott relates, 'evinced an unaffected indifference for the fate of his writings, providing the end of their publication was answered,' and was once overheard muttering, after glancing over the 'Tale of a Tub,' 'Good God! what a genius I had when I wrote that book.' Gentz declined writing political memoirs, or contemporary history, from respect to the memory of those with whom he had acted; and Swift gave up his *History of England*, exclaiming, 'I have found them all such a pack of rascals, I would have no more to say to them.'

As it is worse than useless to keep on repeating that obviously wrong things are wrong, we have refrained from applying the befitting censure to the many reprehensible episodes of this remarkable man's career; amongst which the absorbing passion of a sexagenarian for a girl of nineteen must undoubtedly be ranked. Besides, we rather incline to Goethe's theory, that the business of narrators is with events, and that, if they turn aside to point the moral, they may weaken it by exciting a rebellious and defying spirit in those whom they assume to lead. In this particular case, the blame and ridicule of the incongruity were met half way by the avowal; and some

palliation is to be found in the state of Viennese manners, the toleration of friends, and the fascinating qualities of the object.

It has been confidently asserted that the death of Goethe, 22nd of March, 1832, made a deep impression on Gentz — ‘proximus ardet Ucalegon’ — but an ‘Indian summer’ is fearfully exhaustive of the sap of life; despondency is not unfrequently the sign or forerunner of decay; and if depressing occurrences shortened his life, they were those which occurred in 1830 and 1831. He died on the 9th of June, 1832. ‘Nous l’avons vu mourir doucement, et au son d’une voix qui lui faisait oublier celle du temps.’* Like Johnson, he dreaded death; like Johnson, he met it calmly, and found unexpected consolation in faith:—

‘It is dreadful to meet old age and death. No one understood so well how to fortify me against them as you. I mean, to fortify me humanly; for I am farther advanced in religion than you. I fancy you have remained very heathenish; which, amongst other things, clearly comes of your blind love for that heathen of heathens, Goethe: I, on the contrary, during the last ten years, have become thoroughly Christian, and hold Christianity to be the genuine centre of the world. For all that is still youthful in me, I have to thank this beneficial revolution.’

This was written to Rahel in 1811, and he never fell back into unbelief or indifference. One evening, during the later years of his life, after dining at the Weinberg with Baron Proskesch and two other friends, he accompanied them to Vienna in a carriage; and so fascinating was his conversation, that on arriving at the place where they were to separate, they stopped the carriage between three and four hours to listen to him. The subject was the immortality of the soul, which he eloquently upheld against all the sceptical arguments that could be suggested or recalled. There is a somewhat similar story of Windham passing half the night in the streets in conversation with Burke.

He died in debt; and the sole tribute to his memory, in the way of monument, is a simple tablet placed over his grave by Fanny Elsler. A fitting motto for it might have been taken from Goethe’s ‘*Helena*’—‘*Viel geschmäht und viel bewundert*’ (much abused and much admired). He had fairly earned both the abuse and the admiration; and a dispute whether the good or the bad preponderated, would be the familiar contest about the colour of the bi-coloured shield.

That so little was done for him by his most influential friend, sounds very like a confirmation of Swift’s maxim, that great

* Châteaubriand, ‘*Congrès de Véronne*.’

men seldom do anything for those with whom they live in intimacy*; but his refusal of the Emperor's offer of a promotion, which was to have included pecuniary advantages, suggests a valid excuse for Metternich, although the refusal itself is unaccountable. If Gentz expected to disarm envy by a show of humility or disinterestedness, his ordinary discernment of the springs of human action was at fault; for people far more readily forgive honours and titles than social superiority or influence without rank or wealth; and Gentz's position in the great and gay world, with nothing but his personal qualities to show for it, was precisely that which most stimulated the malice, by wounding the self-love, of his calumniators. The mercenary nature of his relations with other countries was of course their most formidable weapon; which was blunted or parried by the positive and (we believe) well-founded assertion that Metternich was privy to all his transactions with foreign ministers, and that foreign ministers were privy to his unreserved communications with Metternich. Extreme delicacy in money matters is of modern growth amongst public men in England, and thirty years since had not taken root in the despotic Courts of Europe. We question whether it exists even now amongst the official writers of France. All servants of the British Crown are peremptorily forbidden to accept gratifications in any shape from foreign potentates. And we are confident that the same spirit of independence pervades the British press. Naturally, therefore, we hear with surprise of the Austrian Government permitting a public servant of Gentz's eminence to draw on foreign Powers for his chief means of subsistence; and the notoriety of his so doing flings the main responsibility upon them. There was no secrecy, or pretence of secrecy, in the matter; our sole knowledge of his subsidies is derived from his abridged and corrected diaries; and one undeniable fact in his favour is that the whole of his surviving friends dwell most emphatically on his integrity and truthfulness.

From the female point of view, faults and weaknesses became merits and fascinations. In a letter after his death to Ranke, Rahel, after deploring the impossibility of conveying her precise impressions by words, proceeds:—

'Therefore you cannot know that I then, and for that very reason,

* 'They call me nothing but Jonathan, and I said I believed they would leave me Jonathan as they found me, and that I never knew a ministry do anything for those whom they make companions of their pleasures, and I believe you will find it so; but I care not.' (*Journal to Stella*, Feb. 7, 1711.)

loved my lost friend when he said or did something downright childish. I loved him for saying he was so happy to be the first man in Prague,—that all the highest functionaries, great lords, and great ladies, were obliged to send or come to him, &c.—with a laugh of transport, and looking full into my eyes. Wise enough to be silent about this, is every trained distorted animal; but who has the self-betraying soul, the childlike simplicity of heart, to speak it out? There are many whom we are obliged to praise piece by piece, and they do not find their way into the heart by love: there are others, a few, who may be much blamed, but they ever open the heart, and stir it to love. This is what Gentz did for me; and for me he will never die.'

Although this theory of amiability is confirmed by Rochefoucauld, who maintains that we love people rather for their faults than their virtues, such evidence to character would weigh more with a German than with an English tribunal. Yet it is by German modes of thought and conduct that German men and women must principally be judged. The moral atmosphere in which they lived, with their temptations and opportunities, must be kept constantly in view when they are arraigned at the bar of public opinion by posterity; and a purely English standard of right and wrong might obviously lead to unjust or uncharitable conclusions when applied to a *Rabel* or a *Gentz*.

ART. III.—1. *Papers relating to the present Condition and Prospects of the Goldfields in Victoria.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament, April, 1862.

• 2. *Papers relating to the Discovery of Gold in British Columbia.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament, April, 1862.

3. *Geological Observations in South Australia.* By the Rev. JULIAN E. WOODS. 8vo. 1862.

OF all minerals, it might at first sight appear that man could most readily have dispensed with gold. Its comparative scarcity has rendered almost useless the intrinsic qualities which it possesses: it may even be doubted whether it is the best standard of value and instrument of exchange. Yet no other substance, on the surface of the earth, or underneath the surface of the earth, has exercised so powerful an influence over the movements of the human race. We find it suddenly peopling continents—raising nations above surrounding nations—perhaps it is not too much to say, laying the foundations of sciences. The first principles of chemistry, of mineralogy, of metallurgy, disclosed themselves in the

researches of the alchemist. Gold-dust led more Spaniards to follow in the footsteps of Columbus, of Cortez, of Pizarro, than the spirit of adventure, or the religious zeal which sought to ennoble it. Nor are there less conspicuous examples of its influence on the rise of nations. We may trace it through the commercial greatness of the Phœnicians—certainly as old as the days of Abraham—when all was gold from the earrings of the Midianites, their carriers of the Desert, to the chains that were about their camels' necks; through the fleets of Hiram, laden with the gold of Ophir; through the glory of Solomon; through Carthage and her hundred cities along the shores of the Mediterranean—through ancient refinement and barbaric splendour, through Jew and Gentile, through settlement by land and sea; till Spain herself, who, doubtless, had supplied much, if not most, of the golden material, came, in revolving years, to take her place at the head of nations under Charles V. Wherever, in the world's history, a great goldmine has come to light, there a burst of sunshine falls across the dark and troubled stream. But it is for our own time these yellow grains have reserved the chiefest exercise of their latent power,—if, indeed, they are not exhausting themselves in some grand and final effort. Hugely as the shores of the Mediterranean are exceeded by the shores of the Atlantic, so are the shores of the Atlantic exceeded by those of the Pacific. Already, along the vast and hitherto almost silent shores of that great Ocean—from California to Australia, from New Zealand to British Columbia—empires are springing up, and cities grow as it were in a day. History, and now history alone, records the ancient dominion of Mediterranean empire. Its great lights have long gone out; cities built on hills are no longer visible; harbours, where rode the fleets of long dynasties, are mere salt marshes. A chance discovery within our own day—a few yellow grains found in a mill-stream—has laid the foundations of a new and immensely greater world; whose progress, if we are to form any judgment from the experience of some dozen years, promises to exceed in rapidity all that has gone before it. The gigantic growth of the United States of America had no parallel in ancient or modern times, but the state of California has grown as much in one year as many of the Atlantic states in a century. Travellers to our Antipodes have all been taken by surprise at the wonderful rapidity with which English towns, English society, and English institutions had taken root on Australian soil; but Melbourne has grown more populous, more wealthy, and of greater political importance in

ten years than Sydney in fifty. What were absolute solitudes are being peopled by the most enormous consumers which commerce has ever had to supply. From these same solitudes flow so unexpectedly the golden streams which feed countless branches of European industry, already bending beneath their own weight.

Seeing, then, that such golden streams — whether they come from the once gold-bearing hills of Spain, or bubble up through the sands of India, whether sought by way of the Desert, or by ships of Tarshish, by goldseekers of the sixteenth, or by goldseekers of the nineteenth century — are capable of being directed into channels, and, indeed, seem naturally inclined to run in channels fertilising lands the most distant from their sources, it may not be uninteresting if we follow them up to these new sources on the slopes of the great Sierra Nevada and amid the ranges of Australia, and examine into the operations of the men who set their golden tides a-flowing. Such an examination is, at least, not unsuited to the time. Invigorating as have hitherto been these streams, we cannot too carefully watch the rising of the waters. The series of gold discoveries which commenced with 1847 has within these last two years assumed gigantic proportions. Already no less than five British colonies are found to possess extensive and rich gold deposits. The Californian goldminer has tapped reservoirs which are now found to spread downwards through Mexico, upwards through the great Oregon and Washington territories. The British Columbian goldminer, great as are the attractions of British Columbia, has already crossed the Rocky Mountains, and is following the banks of the rivers which expand into the lake system of Canada. Nay, he is already on the banks of the rivers which branch, on one side, to the Arctic Ocean, on the other to the Russian settlements around Bhering Strait. The backwoodsman advancing from the east is met by legions of goldminers coming from the west. The vast forests which seemed to await his more slow axe are felled for the hut and camp-fire of the goldminer. The trapper, already driven from the shores of the Pacific, is again retiring to more quiet regions. The wonderful changes of the North Pole are repeated at the South. As the American goldminer is advancing on eternal snows, so already the Australasian goldminer is exploring the bounds of the great Antarctic Ocean. Armies of goldminers are pouring into New Zealand. The goldfields of New South Wales and Victoria are spreading downwards into Van Diemen's Land, upwards towards the new colony of Queensland. Explorers are discovering auriferous quartz-reefs in the heart

of Australia. How all this will affect our Atlantic world is a question which concerns us most deeply. Will the stream drown the miller? It is almost unnecessary to state that the public faith of Europe, and of a rapidly increasing portion of the other quarters of the globe, is built upon the assumed limitation in the supply of gold. Hitherto, an immense increase in the supply has been productive of unmixed advantage. Millions of human beings, for whom there were but the workhouse and a pauper's grave, have escaped to happy homes in distant and previously unexplored solitudes. Distant and previously unexplored solitudes have assumed, as it were by the wand of enchantment, all the improvements of an age unexampled in its progress. The superfluous emigrant has gone to be a wealthy customer, the relieved operative remains at home to be a busy supplier. Local and temporary circumstances may have marred the result, but to such a result the golden discoveries of the present half century have persistently tended, and with a success the more wonderful as we more closely examine it. The rising of the waters has but made the miller's wheel go round more merrily. Yet it may be well to take frequent note of the change. We have built the mill where by possibility it may be flooded. The rapid accumulation of these discoveries has, indeed, made the subject of inquiry a wide one. Already it extends its influence over questions hitherto apparently unconnected. While boundless fields for employment have been opened for those possessed of no incomes at all, how is a danger to be met so nearly threatening those who are wholly dependent on fixed incomes? While the overcrowded centres of population are being relieved, are we not also losing much of the essential bone and muscle of the country? While the growth of these infant empires exceeds all that has gone before, are they not endangering a metallic currency on which their very existence now hangs? If — instead of endeavouring to tread so tangled a maze — we can succeed, wholly confining ourselves to this new Pacific world, in tracing out the gold-bearing tract of which California and Australia are such widely distant fragments; and if, from an examination of the results of some ten or a dozen years' goldmining, we can gain some inkling into the future of these vast regions, perhaps we shall not offer an unimportant contribution to the solution of the whole subject.

With such a purpose, we need not here enter into the early history of our modern goldmines, or the early operations of the modern goldminer. Indeed, the early gold discoveries in California and Australia were so fully described at the time, and

these discoveries are yet so recent, that it would be needless to recount them. What took place in California and Australia in the years immediately following 1847 and 1851 is now taking place—with some better preparations, a little less novelty, and perhaps, more fit goldseekers—in New Zealand, Nova Scotia, British Columbia, and probably, ere the year closes, will be taking place in some new region. Now, as then, crowds are pouring into wildernesses; producers, shippers, and whole armies of distributors are following them with the necessaries and even comforts of life. The forest is giving way to goldminers' tents, the tents to substantially built towns. The same changes are yet taking place even within the gold regions of California and Australia themselves. Fresh gold deposits are being yearly discovered therein. An auriferous 'lead' is traced out into a hitherto unexplored tract of country. Or a miner, travelling from one goldfield to another, is struck by the auriferous appearance of some intermediate district, and opens a new goldfield. Again the woods give way to tents, tents to towns; absolute solitude yields to the hum of steam and the din of quartz-stampers. The Sacramento valley of 1848, the Turon of 1851, are yearly being repeated. But that the goldseekers of 1848 and 1851 have almost wholly given place to more practised goldminers—to men who had qualified themselves for a pursuit not entirely new to them in the mines of Cornwall*, among our northern coalpits, or deep in the mineral lodes of the Hartz and the Erz-Gebirge,—the scenes are nearly the same over again. Leaving these, then, to their future development, we shall ask the reader to accompany us to some of the earlier goldfields, opened at the commencement of this golden era, and to examine into their present condition and the prospects of the new communities which they have brought about them.

The Parliamentary Papers which we have placed first at the head of this article contain the results of a visit of inspection

* In 1846, Sir R. Murchison, who two years earlier had compared the eastern ridge of Australia with the Ural Mountains, and first suggested in print the auriferous character of the former, advised the Cornish tin miners who were then out of employment to emigrate and dig for gold in Australia, and wash it as they did their tin ore (see *Trans. Geol. Soc. of Cornwall*, 1846). In 1848 some results were in his possession, and thereon he wrote a letter to Earl Grey, then Secretary for the Colonies, indicating that the all-important question of the gold of Australia, and the laws relating thereto, should be well considered by the Government (see *Parliamentary Papers*, third series); yet three years elapsed before the year 1851, when Mr. Hargreaves opened the diggings.

which the Governor of the colony of Victoria has lately paid to its goldfields. At a time when the whole colony has been rendered uneasy by the conflicting opinions of geologists as to the durability of gold deposits and the auriferous character of quartz-reefs as they are followed from the surface, he has descended to the bottom of the deepest 'leads,' examined the quartz-dykes at the various levels hitherto reached, and traced the rapid, and indeed wonderful, progress of the large goldfields' towns which have replaced the tent and hut of the early goldminer. The colony of Victoria, too, has had the aid of able geologists who have now for some years watched the changing phases of its goldmining. Mr. Selwyn's maps of the auriferous districts, and Professor M'Coy's researches into the same subject, do honour to the scientific attainments of the University of Melbourne. Nor must we omit the great activity of its government departments in collecting and publishing goldmining statistics, aided by a rapidly increasing newspaper press. Such assistance induces us to select the goldfields of Victoria as furnishing a fair illustration of the general growth and tendency of the golden discoveries of these last dozen years.

The goldfields of California might, indeed, at first sight appear, from their somewhat prior discovery, entitled to the central position in our sketch. But, besides that, in the case of California, we have not access to any complete system of goldmining statistics—nor, indeed, do we believe that it exists—the Californian goldfields, though first discovered, have not yet reached that more permanent condition which now distinguishes the earlier goldfields of Australia. The comparative abundance of water has led the Californian goldminer to rely chiefly on the hosepipe. The enormous slopes which descend from the snow-capped peaks of the Sierra Nevada to the shores of the Pacific always enable him to place his 'water-head' over his 'claim.' The mere action of the water playing on the soil, has washed away whole hills of detritus overlying the auriferous stratum, and has afterwards separated the gold from the 'wash-dirt.' Hence the hosepipe has served him for pick and shovel, bucket and windlass. While the Australian goldminer has been busy in bringing to efficiency an enormous amount of steam machinery for boring into the solid rock, the Californian goldminer has hastened from one goldfield to another, and confined himself chiefly to the richer deposits of the surface. In Victoria, we are dealing with a British colony, under the constitution, laws, and regulations common to the various British colonies in which extensive goldfields are now known to exist. As might naturally be

expected, our wide-spread dependencies have brought the chief goldfields of the globe under the British Crown. What the Victorian goldmines and goldminers have now become, after the space of ten years, may guide us in speculating on the future of our other various gold-producing dependencies. What we write of Victoria may, too, with little variation, be written of its sister colony of New South Wales. New Zealand commences its golden career under identical circumstances. British Columbia, it is true, does not at present draw its chief population from the home country. This, however, may be but temporary, while in all other respects — in soil, climate, form of government — it closely resembles the southern portions of Australia and New Zealand. Before, however, confining ourselves to the table-lands and slopes of the dividing range of Victoria, forming the auriferous region of that colony, it may not be an uninteresting digression if we take a hasty glance at the geographical position of the whole series of gold operations which followed the Californian discoveries of 1847.

In September, 1847, gold was found on the banks of the Sacramento. It was the commencement of a series of gold discoveries, occurring in the following order:—1. The State of California; 2. The Colony of New South Wales; 3. The Colony of Victoria; 4. The Colony of British Columbia; 5. The Colony of Nova Scotia; 6. The South Island of New Zealand. By more minute examination, at various succeeding periods, gold has been traced out into various neighbouring colonies and districts from each of these great areas, but we take these six to be the chief central gold-bearing tracts as yet opened. Three of these auriferous regions, it will be seen, are situated in North America; three in that assemblage of island and continent known as Australasia. The goldfields of Nova Scotia are as yet so little developed that we shall not endeavour to trace their connexion with any other auriferous region or parent range: New Zealand we shall reserve. There can be little danger in reducing our four remaining auriferous regions to two. The goldfields of New South Wales and Victoria extend, without any interruption whatever, along the slopes of the great mountain range which separates the eastern seaboard of Australia from the interior of that island or continent. The goldfields of California and British Columbia are, it is true, separated by the Oregon territory, but, for some years past, the goldminers of California have been extending their searches with success into Oregon, and some of the richest deposits in British Columbia have been found on the tributaries of the great stream which gives its name to the territory. We may, therefore, regard the goldfields

of California and British Columbia as occurring without interruption along the western slopes of the Rocky Mountains and its great spurs and subordinate ranges — the Sierra Nevada, the Bald Mountains, the Peak Mountains, and a system of parallel subordinate ranges entering within the Arctic Circle and as yet unexplored. We have thus two great gold-bearing regions extending along two widely distant elevations, and probably owing their auriferous character to some influence connected with their upheaval.

Let us consider these two gold-bearing systems a little more minutely. One of them, whether passing under the name of the Chippewayan Range, the Rocky Mountains, the Mexican Alps of North America, or the Andes of South America, we may take to form the eastern seaboard of the Pacific, almost from Pole to Pole — from Bhering Strait in the north to Cape Horn in the south. Emerging from the depths of the Southern Ocean on Tierra del Fuego, and wholly composing that island, the culminating ridge of this stupendous chain stretches to within the Arctic Circle — now almost buried beneath the waters of the Pacific, and merely leaving a string of islands off the coast to mark the inroads of the ocean over its former valleys and round its high peaks; next opposing a bluff mainland barrier to its waters; and now retiring many miles inland. Throughout the whole extent of this vast elevation, from Chili in the south to the British possessions in the north, its slopes, spurs, and subordinate ranges are now yielding gold. From Chili we mount through Bolivia, Peru, Equador, New Granada, all still continuing to yield the precious metal after some three centuries of goldmining. Thence, after we pass the Isthmus, we find the goldminer at work through Mexico, California, Oregon, Washington, till at length we come to our own possessions, stretching to the shores of the Arctic Ocean.

That the whole of this great ridge, from south to north, had once a sea slope, as broad as that now leading up from Vancouver Island to the heights of the Rocky Mountains, admits of little doubt. We may trace its fragments among the igneous and crystalline rocks of Cape Horn, granite being the axis of the elevation throughout its whole extent. We may trace it through the string of granite islets lying off the whole coast of Patagonia; and again in the string of islands extending from Vancouver Island to the Sea of Kamschatka and the head waters of the Pacific — as Queen Charlotte Island, Pitt Island, Bank Island, Prince of Wales Island, George III. Island, and a host of rocky islets, in all of which gold has been found. On the coast of California, too, 'the Beach Diggings' are a well-known

feature. At certain tides a bluish sand, not unlike the pipeclay of Ballarat, is thrown up by the waves, and is found to contain gold in considerable quantities. These and other testimonies may warrant the supposition that at one period the whole Pacific seaboard of North and South America possessed a broad auriferous slope descending from the culminating ridge of this mountain chain, running almost from Pole to Pole. We draw attention to these characteristics of this great auriferous system, as we shall find them repeated in a widely distant system, with which, however, it may not be impossible to establish a connexion.

It becomes, we think, at once apparent that the geologists who sought at first to restrict the deposits of gold to a narrow compass were mistaken; and that no such Goldfield Restriction Bill, as they spoke of, exists in nature. This ground is obviously untenable. But although the range of territory in which gold has been discovered is thus extensive, it must be borne in mind that the great principle laid down by Sir Roderick Murchison in his earlier researches and repeated in the last edition of his 'Siluria,' has not, as far as we know, been impugned; viz., that the rocks which are the most auriferous are of the Silurian age, and that a certain geological zone only in the crust of the globe is auriferous at all. Gold has never been found in any stratified formations composed of secondary or tertiary deposits, but only in crystalline and Paleozoic rocks, or in the drift from those rocks, which is a tertiary accumulation of Pliocene age. Hence by far the largest portion of land on the face of the globe never contains gold, and it may be confidently predicted that none will be found in it. The most usual original position of the metal is in quartz-ore veinstones that traverse altered Silurian slates (chiefly Lower Silurian), frequently near their junction with eruptive rocks. Sometimes, however, it is partially diffused through the body of rocks of igneous origin. The oldest rocks—such as the gneiss of Scandinavia and Scotland, the Laurentian and Huronian of the American continent, the Cambrian of Britain—contain no gold. If these propositions are correct, the circumstance which really determines the deposit of the much-sought-for metal is the age of the rocks in which it occurs; and, curiously enough, the 'age of gold' belongs to one of the earliest—though not *the* earliest—geological period of the globe.

Let us now cross the Pacific to our other great gold-bearing system.

The Coast Range of Australia runs from the extreme northern point of that island, or continent, to its extreme

southern point; overlooking, along its whole extent, the Pacific Ocean, and attaining to its greatest elevation, or culminating ridge, about 100 miles from the sea-beach. It, however, neither begins nor ends in Australia: emerging from the Southern Ocean in Van Diemen's Land, to the south of Australia, it traverses the whole of that island from south to north; thence, plunging into the ocean, it maintains its course across Bass Strait, and lands on the Australian continent.* Traversing the whole of the eastern coast of Australia, it at length reaches York Peninsula, the extreme northern portion of the continent. Running down York Peninsula to a mere point, it again plunges into the waves, and struggles across Torres Strait, dotting it with a string of islets composed of the same rock, and placed so closely together that a ship can sail through but few of them. Again landing, on New Guinea, it rises to more than its former Australian grandeur, and continues its course along the Pacific Ocean through the whole of that island, sending off on its northern coast a branch to the west, whose course we may afterwards trace.† So far, it is certain that this great chain once formed a western boundary to the Pacific Ocean, running parallel with the Andes up to the Equator, though at the enormous interval of nearly half the globe. At the Equator,* however, we are not stopped. All

* 'On a fine day that course may be traced from the top of the headland, beautifully delineated by the chain of the islands of Bass Strait. These islands, whether high and crowned with peaks, or low and crested only by the white sparkling foam of the sea, appear in their winding and lengthened array like the glittering snow-capped domes of the Andes, when seen above the region of the dense clouds which clothe their lower regions.' (*Physical Description of New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land, by Coupt Strzelecki.*)

† For the little we know of New Guinea we are chiefly indebted to the voyages of H. M. S. 'Fly.' Captain Blackwood traced the continuation of this great chain through the island, and fixed the heights of two of its peaks at 10,040 and 13,705 feet above sea-level. The interior, however, of New Guinea is wholly unknown. Now that we have at length cleared up the mystery which so long hung over the interior of Australia, perhaps we may hope to hear something of the next greatest island of the globe. 'I know of no 'part of the world,' writes Mr. Jukes, the naturalist of the expedition, in his 'Narrative of the Surveying Voyage of H. M. S. "Fly,"' 'the 'exploration of which is so flattering to the imagination, so likely to 'be fruitful in interesting results, whether to the naturalist, the ethnologist, or the geographer, and altogether calculated to gratify the 'enlightened curiosity of the adventurous explorer, as the interior of 'New Guinea.'

our scientific explorers of the Australasian group agree in regarding that vast collection of island and mainland as the remains of an ancient, and, for the most part, low continent, separated into fragments, not by any sudden convulsion of nature, but by the slow inroads of the ocean creeping through its valleys and lowlands, unprotected by the harder stratified rocks. All its islands, even including its countless solitary rocks, now in the midst of the ocean — excepting those of coral formation (if, indeed, these latter are not superstructures raised on submarine volcanic peaks, as is now more generally supposed) — still preserve an appearance similar to that of the peaks and ridges of the Great Range remaining unbroken on the continent of Australia. The rocks choking up Bass Strait, and Torres Strait, which are, beyond all doubt, detached links of the Australian mountain chain, and which Count Strzelecki likens to the domes of the Andes, are precisely similar to the countless groups of rocks and islets found off the north coast of New Guinea. If we look at a late map of the basin of the Pacific, we shall find little difficulty in tracing a line of such links — some of them, indeed, of very considerable magnitude — until we actually reach the southern point of the Peninsula of Kamtschatka, where we again strike a range running north and making for Bhering Strait, the keystone of our arch. From New Guinea we step on the Caroline Islands, a group which brings us to lat. 8° beyond the Equator. Here we meet the Ladrões, marking out a northern course up to lat 22° . From these, by a series of stepping-stones — the Jardines, the Lobos, the Bonin group — we reach the most southern of the Japanese Islands, in lat. 29° , and again ascend the heights of a great gold-bearing range. The Japanese Islands thence stream away to lat. 45° . From lat 45° our stepping-stones become ever more frequent and regular. The Kurile Islands land us in Kamtschatka almost with dry feet. From Kamtschatka we can again reach the Russian settlements of North America by way of the Aleutian Archipelago. ‘

Or, by taking a more westerly route from New Guinea, through Malaysia and the Philippine Islands, Formosa, and a string of islets leading up to the Japanese Islands, we arrive at the same northern point without quitting volcanic ground. This latter is the route taken by Humboldt as the chief ‘volcanic fissure of elevation,’ though he does not lose sight of the former, and even draws attention to the existence of subsidiary parallel ranges. But, indeed, we are not restricted to either route. The whole of Australasia, Malaysia, and the volcanic islands thence forming a broad band up to Kamtschatka and the Aleu-

tian Archipelago exhibit, as had already been observed by Malte-Brun, a system of chains, for the most part running north and south, though occasionally crossed by transverse chains, in which we may trace the 'cross-knots' overrunning and tying the ranges of the Andes as described by Humboldt. Thus, without assuming that any particular line of volcanic fracture once formed the culminating ridge of this former sea-board, we may readily trace from Van Diemen's Land to Bhering Strait, from the confines of south-land to the confines of north-land, a well-marked system of ridges, or elevated chains, forming parallel, transverse, and subordinate groups; portions of which, of vast extent, do, indeed, remain entire, but the whole, for the most part, being broken up into detached links, by the slow action of the waves of the Pacific, or more probably by the great convulsions of nature which are indelibly marked on all the main features of the globe.

Thus, while the bed of the Pacific itself is, considering its vast magnitude, wonderfully free from any break in its crust, while 'the Pacific Ocean,' as Humboldt writes, 'whose surface is 'nearly one-sixth greater than that of the whole dry land of our planet, whose breadth in the equatorial regions, from the Galapagos to the Pelew Islands, is nearly two-fifths of the whole circumference of the globe'—presents fewer smoking volcanoes, 'fewer openings through which the interior of the planet still 'maintains active communication with its atmospheric envelope 'than does the single island of Java,' on the other hand, we find this vast basin surrounded by a well-marked line of volcanic fracture, at present containing seven-eighths of the known volcanoes of the globe.* Indeed, Mr. Jukes, so early as 1844, before the new series of gold discoveries had brought into such importance the vast shores of the Pacific, traced the links of this trans-oceanic range.

'Thus, "beginning from New Zealand," in the words of Humboldt, and proceeding first for a considerable distance in a north-west direction, we can pass through New Guinea, the Sunda Islands, the Philippines, and the east of Asia, and, ascending to the Aleutian Islands, can redescend to the southward through the north-west portion of America, Mexico, Central and south America, to the extremity of Chili; thus making the entire circuit of the Pacific Ocean,

* The laborious and careful calculations of Humboldt place the number of known volcanoes at 225, of which 198 are found thus surrounding the basin of the Pacific. See, also, the new edition of Mr. Scrope's admirable and instructive work on 'Volcanoes,' which the author has now completed, by the most recent observations on the volcanoes of the Western Pacific (p. 460.).

and finding it surrounded throughout a length of 26,400 geographical miles by a series of recognisable monuments of volcanic activity.*

So continuous and well-marked a line of volcanic elevation has, of course, drawn the attention of geologists to the causes of its formation. Humboldt's view is, perhaps, the most satisfactory, and has certainly remained undisturbed. Whatever may have been the former boundaries of the Pacific, its bed attained to its present depth at a comparatively late period. If we suppose the Pacific to have been a vast shallow lake, similar to its numerous seas and gulfs which still remain—as the Chinese Sea, Yellow Sea, Sea of Japan, Sea of Ochotsk, &c., with low continents forming its east and west boundaries—in fact, such low continents as we still find, on its west side behind the Great Range of Australia; on its east side, in Patagonia and La Plata, behind the Andes—then, a subsidence of its bed, the bed itself remaining whole, would give us such a line of fracture running all round the basin. The unbroken crust, too, composing the bed, thus pressed down on the molten mass beneath the earth's surface, would cause a quantity of it to rush towards the line of fracture and endeavour to find vent there. Just as if, on a frozen lake, a portion of water was drawn off, or a weight, too great to be borne, was placed on the ice. In either case we should have an encircling line of fracture, through which the waters of the lake would be squeezed up. The general appearance of the Andes suggested, at an early period of geological inquiry, some such origin. It was not, however, until Count Strzelecki made known the existence of a precisely similar and parallel elevation on the other side of the Pacific, which Humboldt successfully traced out up to Bering Strait and by way of the Aleutian Archipelago into North America, as we have already described, that all the links were supplied.†

* Narrative of Surveying Voyages of H.M.S. 'Fly.'

† Mr. Darwin, however, would seem to guard us against supposing that the bed of the Pacific attained to its present depths at one single subsidence. In his 'Voyage of a Naturalist,' when examining the American Andes, he writes:—'I believe that the solid axis of a mountain differs in its manner of formation from a volcanic hill only in the molten stone having been repeatedly injected instead of having been repeatedly ejected. Moreover, I believe that it is impossible to explain the structure of great mountain chains, such as that of the Cordillera, where the strata, capping the injected axis of plutonic rock, have been thrown on their edges along several parallel and neighbouring lines of elevation, except on the view of the rock of the axis having been repeatedly injected after intervals sufficiently

So far we have been dealing with the general progress of geological inquiry before the commencement of the gold discoveries. It was known that a line of fracture might be traced all round the Pacific Ocean from land's end to land's end. It was known that this line of fracture, marked by seven-eighths of the volcanoes of the globe, bore evident traces of a connexion with the bed of the Pacific — many of the volcanoes still continuing to throw up sea-mud, and even fish. It was known that a slope at one period led up from the Pacific to the culminating ridge, or line of fracture, at least as broad as the portion of it which now remains to form the auriferous regions of California and British Columbia. The question now is, whether any scientific connexion can be traced and established between the series of gold discoveries, now so rapidly spreading on either side of the Pacific, and this system of volcanic elevation, with which, to a very great extent, it coincides? It may even be conjectured that this whole volcanic belt is one vast and continuous goldfield. The late discoveries in British Columbia remove all doubt from the eastern arm. From Chili to Russian America the gold-miner is now at work upon it. Of the western arm we have again the goldminer at work through New Zealand, Van Diemen's Land, and along the whole of the Australian portion up to the tropic. Beyond the tropic, it is true, there remains an immense gap, till we again arrive at the Russian settlements, unknown, or almost unknown, to Europe. Yet, of the little we know of this gap, its auriferous character is the most conspicuous. New Guinea, it is certain, contains gold. With the natives of the vast region of Malaysia a gold trade has long been carried on — probably needing but the introduction of such machinery as is now used on the goldfields of Victoria and New South Wales to be immensely developed. Recent evidences would lead us to infer that the Japanese Islands contain quantities of gold incredible before the Californian and Australian discoveries — indeed, up to a very late period the Japanese were ready to exchange gold for its weight in silver. Of the vastness of this gold-bearing elevation, if such it be, we may form some better idea when we call to mind its breadth and the

‘long to allow the upper parts or wedges to cool and become solid; for if the strata had been thrown into their present highly inclined, vertical, and even inverted positions, by a single blow, the very bowels of the earth would have gushed out, and instead of beholding abrupt mountain-axes of rock solidified under great pressure, deluges of lava would have flowed out at innumerable points of every line of elevation.’

distance to which its most highly auriferous spurs and subsidiary ranges penetrate on either side from the parent ridge, or main line of fracture. The whole of the Victorian goldfields, for instance, are on a spur penetrating some 300 miles from the principal range; while many such spurs remain totally unexplored, both on the eastern and western arm. But, on the other hand, the connexion between volcanic action and auriferous deposits is by no means irrefragably established; although, no doubt, volcanic action may frequently have forced upwards to the earth's surface those crystalline veins in the Paleozoic rocks in which, as we have seen, gold has alone been discovered.

We need not, however, prolong our digression by entering into any minute examination of the *vexata quæstio* of geology—the origin of metalliferous veins; among which mineralogists are now content to class gold-bearing quartz-reefs. Of the various theories put forward, two, and but two, have survived; and each of these two hangs by an exceedingly slight thread. According to one of these theories, called the 'Aqueous,' the clefts or dykes in the rock were filled up by infiltration from above, and the metals, held in solution, gradually deposited on the sides of the dyke. According to the other theory, called the 'Igneous,' these dykes extend down to the subterranean fires of the globe, and the metals, fused to sublimation, ascending thence in the form of vapour, have returned to their solid state on meeting the cold air in the upper portion of the dykes. Neither of these theories accounts in a manner at all satisfactory for the presence of a matrix in the dyke, among which the metal is distributed. Sir Roderick Murchison maintains that, however the ore may have been originally diffused in the matrix, it was segregated from the matrix, and formed into veins, geodes, and strings at a comparatively recent (geological) period. With the practical difficulties of this subject, which have so long embarrassed the geologist and the mineralogist, we cannot pretend to grapple, but it is worth while to inquire whether a reconsideration of the Igneous theory in connexion with this vast gold-bearing formation might not be likely to afford new light, and to lead to some saving in the immense sums now expended, and in many cases lost, in tracing metalliferous veins. Auriferous quartz-reefs are now admitted to be true mineral veins. So far, we have one step certain. It is also certain that gold resists almost all the influences to which the metals, *in situ*, are exposed, and which have caused so many secondary changes in baser metals after deposition in their lodes. Quartz, too, the matrix of gold, would appear to have a like exemption from such secondary changes. In the auri-

ferous quartz-reef, then, we are brought face to face with a condition unchanged since the original formation of the vein, — an opportunity which may be in vain looked for among any of the baser lodes.

The latest contribution to the geology of Australia is that of Mr. Julian Woods, who writes with great spirit and precision of the southern portion of the territory which he had occasion to explore. His observations on the volcanic action which may be traced in South Australia are extremely curious; and the following remark belongs to the inquiry on which we are now engaged:—

‘At about fifty miles east of Mount Gambier, on the Victoria side of the boundary, there commences an immense volcanic district, which may be traced with very little interruption to Geelong (262 miles distant), by immense masses of trap rock and extinct craters of large dimensions. This kind of country extends considerably to the north of this line; and it is underneath the trap rocks there found, at the junction of the Silurian slates and ancient granites, that the extensive Australian goldfields are worked. This large tract of country has evidently belonged to one immense subterranean igneous lake, and the various craters which appear are evidences of the manner in which it has sought relief from time to time.’ (*Woods, Geology of Southern Australia*, p. 290.)

But the occasional occurrence of gold in connexion with these trap rocks and underneath basalt (the blue stone of the diggers) is accidental.* Mr. Woods thus gives the history of these formations:—

‘Gold veins occur in rocks of the Lower Silurian age, which cropped out on the former soil of Victoria. These were decomposed by the action of water in creeks, or by weathering. The gold thus liberated became rounded by attrition into “nuggets,” and deposited in the alluvial soil formed of decomposed rock. After these operations, and in no way connected with them, the land was overflowed by lava, and many creeks which were full of nuggets were thus covered over. Miners are sometimes much astonished at finding trees and fragments of pebble, rounded, underneath the blue stone they have penetrated. The former existence of creeks explains the difficulty. One of the richest goldfields, perhaps, in the world is worked in the bed of an ancient creek thus covered over. This is the Clunes Mine, at Creswick’s Creek, not far from Ballarat. To look for gold, then, because trap rock occurred, would be like searching for it in tertiary limestone.’ (*Woods*, p. 297.)

Leaving, then, this vast basin of the Pacific, which a chance discovery within our own day has suddenly covered with noble fleets, and lined with a hardy race laying the foundations of empires, we shall now return to our original purpose, and by aid

of the results of some dozen years' goldmining on its western arm, endeavour to obtain some insight into the future progress of the vast regions now being peopled. We must again ask the reader to accompany us to the Great Mountain Chain of the Antipodes, the largest fragment now left on the Asiatic side of this gold-bearing elevation. The northern portion, however, of this range, between New Guinea and the tropic, remains as yet wholly unexplored. On the tropic, the goldfield of Canoona was discovered in 1857, and brings evidence of gold so far to the north.* From Canoona, travelling southward along the ridge, we enter the colony of New South Wales, and pass, on our right hand and on our left, its several goldfields. Arriving at the southern extremity of New South Wales, we stand on the boundary line of the colony of Victoria. Here, amid perpetual snow, the only great stream of Australia, the Murray, takes its rise at the base of the loftiest pinnacle of the Range. Even here, however, we are not above the line of goldfields. Kiandra, or the Snowy River Goldfield, attracted to this spot its thousands of goldminers from the neighbouring colonies in 1860, and still maintains a large goldmining population. Thence the Range pursues its southern course across Bass Strait, and enters the island of Van Diemen's Land. Our way, however, lies through the colony of Victoria. At the sources of the Murray, the Great Range of Australia throws off an immense spur at right angles to itself. This spur, however, does not make for the Pacific, as some of the great auriferous spurs of our eastern arm — the Sierra Nevada of California, the Peak Range of British Columbia — but trends in the opposite direction, and traverses the whole colony of Victoria from east to west, scattering itself towards the west into the Australian Pyrenees, the Grampians, Mount Ararat, Mount William, and other small offshoots and hills, until finally it disappears altogether. This spur bears the same relation to the colony of Victoria as the Great Coast Range to the whole of Australia, and, indeed, is known within the colony as 'the Dividing Range,' under which title we shall in future speak of it. As the auriferous quartz-reefs and alluvial gold deposits found along the slopes of this spur far exceed in richness any

* As the goldfield of Canoona, in the neighbourhood of Port Curtis, lies within the new colony of Queensland, we might have added another to our list of gold-bearing British colonies. The gold deposits of Canoona, however, though exceedingly rich, were not traced to any considerable extent, and the goldfield has been since almost abandoned, the miners returning to the better known districts of New South Wales and Victoria.

hitherto discovered on the main elevation, we shall take a hasty glance at its chief natural features before confining ourselves to the operations of the goldminer.

The ridge of the Dividing Range of Victoria maintains a mean distance of about seventy-five miles from the sea-coast along Bass Strait, from which there is a gentle ascent—the ridge itself, or more generally the broken, thickly-timbered table-lands which form its highest elevation, seldom rising, exclusive of a few peaks, more than 1,000 feet above sea-level. Towards the interior of the colony, the fall is even more gentle—the country opening out into wide plains and lightly-timbered park-like districts until the river Murray, the northern boundary of the colony, is reached, at a distance of some 200 miles from the highest elevation.

Indeed, we may here observe, the whole of the vast binary system, with its subsidiary ranges and spurs, surrounding the basin of the Pacific, is throughout separable into two distinct features. We have, first, a slope on each side leading up to the culminating ridge, or line of fracture, and which we may call the auriferous regions. These slopes have little of the ordinary appearance of mountains, and seem mere crummings and swellings of the plains at their base; their strata being upheaved into undulations, probably from the motion of the molten mass beneath, without any rupture of the surface. Next, we have the culminating ridge, shot up perpendicularly through the line of fracture, and assuming all the fantastic shapes—domes, pinnacles, and turrets—to be found amid the snow-capped Andes and Australian Cordillera. This latter feature appears to be wholly non-auriferous, and is entirely wanting on some of the smaller spurs, as, particularly, the Dividing Range of Victoria, where the molten mass has come to the surface only, in single points, and has formed no line of fracture through the earth's crust. Humboldt's description of that portion of the American arm which traverses Mexico affords an excellent picture of the more general features of the whole system. After alluding to the prevalent idea, chiefly formed from incorrect maps, that this mighty chain runs through North and South America like 'a rampart wall,' he continues:—

'In reality, however, the mountainous part of Mexico is a broad, mighty intumescence, which does, indeed, hold its way continuously at a height of from 3,500 to 7,400 feet in the assigned direction, between the two seas; but upon which, as in the Caucasus and Central Asia, loftier volcanic mountain systems, following partial and very different directions, rise to above 15,000 and 17,800 feet. The direction of these partial groups, which have broken forth over

fissures which are also not parallel with each other, are, for the most part, independent of the ideal axis which can be drawn through the middle of the whole swelling wave of the flattened ridge. These remarkable relations in the form of the ground occasion an illusion which heightens the picturesque effect of this beautiful land. The grand mountains clothed with perpetual snow appear to rise as from a plain. The surface of the softly-swelling undulations on the high plain is scarcely distinguished from the plains of the lowland, and it is only the climate, the diminished temperature under the same parallel of latitude, which reminds us that we have ascended.*

Now, if from this 'broad intumescence' we wholly remove its towering 'mountain system,' or, at least, leave merely an isolated peak here and there, and reduce our remaining 'swelling wave' to a scale of some two-and-a-half inches to the foot, that is from 5,300 feet of elevation to some 1,500, in changing from the main axis itself to its subsidiary spurs, we shall have an exact picture of that branch spur known as the Dividing Range of Victoria.

A spur itself, it, however, has its own spurs, which it sends to the right and left, and which penetrate to a considerable distance from the main line of intumescence. Advancing from its junction with the Great Coast Range of the continent, we pass the Dandenong Ranges, the Plenty Ranges, the Mount Alexander Ranges, the Crowland Ranges, the Pleasant Ranges—all highly auriferous, and many of them carrying far into the surrounding plain the richest goldfields in the world, as Bendigo, the Ovens, M'Ivor, &c. The few peaks which rise above the surrounding swell along the line of main ridge, and, more usually, on its branch ranges—as Mount Alexander, Mount Ararat, Mount Blackwood—where the underlying granite has shot up through the sandstone strata and wholly displaced them, have, though not found auriferous, as the most distinguishing features of their districts, in many cases given their names to adjacent goldfields. Besides these non-auriferous peaks, we occasionally find small patches of country where the granite has risen to the level of the surface without actually bursting forth, in which also the stratified rock has disappeared:—
'Irregular-shaped areas of various extent, exclusively occupied by granite rocks, occur at intervals throughout the goldfields. The quartz-veins are suddenly cut off on coming in contact with the granite, and no gold has ever been obtained from these granite areas at a distance from their junction with the stratified rocks.'† With these exceptions, the whole of the

* 'Cosmos'—General Sabine's translation.

† 'Report on the Quartz-Reefs of Victoria, 1860,' by Mr. Selwyn, the Government Geologist.

Dividing Range of Victoria and its several branch ranges, extending sometimes for a distance of fifty and sixty miles on either side of it, may be regarded as auriferous, being traversed, from their first faint upheaval on the surrounding plain to the culminating ridge, by a system of frequent and parallel quartz-reefs, and containing at present between eighty and one hundred known, and as yet isolated, alluvial goldfields, whose boundaries are, however, daily extending and approaching toward each other, leaving little doubt but that they will ultimately unite and form one continuous network of golden 'leads,' with meshes, of course, more or less wide, occupied by these non-auriferous patches. The whole of this region of intumescence, including its non-auriferous patches, may be roughly set down at 30,000 square miles, the whole area of the colony itself being estimated at 86,831.

In the Dividing Range and its offshoots arise the few streams of the present day which find their way, or attempt to find their way, to the ocean on one side, or the Murray on the other. Scarcely any one of these streams deserves the name of river. They are, in fact, the Australian 'creek;' a succession of ponds, or water holes, almost dry and totally unconnected during the six or eight summer months, and, during the remaining portion of the year, strung together by a muddy torrent. They would appear to have no influence whatever on the unsealing of the auriferous quartz-reefs and the consequent deposition of gold in leads and gutters on the bed-rock, or 'bottom;' though, as water is essential to the separation of alluvial gold from the 'washdirt,' or auriferous stratum, by the miner, each goldfield has generally been opened in the neighbourhood, or along the course of some creek or water-channel.* The beds of the ancient streams which broke open the upper portions of the quartz-reefs, and scattered their contents on the floor of the bed-rock, now lie buried beneath accumulations of non-auriferous detritus from the adjacent hills and ranges, and have long ceased their operations. These same accumulations of detritus, too, cover the remaining portions of the quartz-reefs, and protect them from further injury; so that all gold-mining operations of nature, if we may so speak, throughout the whole of this auriferous region have long ceased. To a

* So, too, the auriferous alluvial deposits of the Ural chain — 'Varying in thickness and importance according to the original depressions, or cavities, in which they have been deposited, these materials lie at all levels, the little modern stream having had no sort of influence in accumulating them.' (*Russia and the Ural Mountains*, by Sir R. Murchison.)

great extent, indeed, this is true throughout the whole system encircling the Pacific, and, with even less exceptions, along the gold-bearing flanks of the Ural, as described by Murchison. Where, however, as in New South Wales and California, snow-capped ridges shoot high above 'the broad intumescence,' and send down streams so impetuous as to eat into the living rock, and to keep their beds clear of all accumulating débris, the quartz-reefs are still losing their upper portions, and parting with the gold disseminated through them.

With this hasty glance at the chief natural features of that portion of the auriferous system within the colony of Victoria, we shall now confine ourselves to the operations of the gold-miner upon it.

'An Act for the better Management of the Goldfields of 'Victoria,' passed in 1856 by the Colonial Parliament, divides the whole of this auriferous region into six Mining Districts, each called after its chief goldfield, or, more properly, the chief town on its chief goldfield, which does not always bear the same name. We have thus the six following Mining Districts — Ballarat, Castlemaine, Sandhurst, Maryborough, Beechworth, Ararat. This division is purely arbitrary, and is unconnected with any geographical or mineralogical features. The sole connecting link between the Colonial Government and the goldfields is the Warden — the Gold Commissioner of the early 'diggings.' His duty is restricted to the settling of small disputes in goldmining operations; reporting on the advisability of granting Crown leases of auriferous lands to co-operative companies; and drawing up returns as to the state of his goldfield. Each goldfield, and sometimes each division of a goldfield where it is a large one, has its own Warden, whose correspondence with the Government, however, passes through the hands of the Chief Warden of the District. With these duties, their interference in the economy of the goldfields ceases. Each Mining District possesses its own Mining Board, composed of members, one from each of its separate goldfields, and elected — everything being, of course, done by ballot — by its resident goldminers, each of whom possesses a returning vote, and can also sit as a member of the Board if returned. These Boards arrange all goldmining operations within their respective districts. They determine the quantity of ground to be held by each miner, or co-operative company of miners; their tenure, by lease, or actual occupation, or, in cases, by the employment of a specified number of labourers or amount of machinery; the different modes by which the various operations of quartz-mining, alluvial-mining, deep-sinking, shallow-sinking,

sluicing, puddling, are to be conducted; and, in general, construct all bye-laws proper for their respective districts, and consistent with the general terms of the Goldfields Act. Each member receives a small allowance for his attendance on board days, and holds office during three years, with power of re-election. Within each Mining District there is also established a Court of Mines, before which come all goldmining disputes above the adjudication of the Warden. The judges of the Courts of Mines, in common with the Supreme Court judges of the colony, are entirely independent of the Government, and hold office *quamdiu se bene gesserint*. Matters of considerable importance, and of curious intricacy, come before them. There is, however, a power of appeal from their decision to the Supreme Court of the colony. Courts of Petty Sessions are held once a week throughout the goldfields' towns; most of the principal storekeepers and the wealthier quartzminers and alluvial claimowners holding the office of Justice of the Peace. A rural police, closely resembling the Irish Constabulary, are thinly distributed over the Mining Districts; and a visit from the judges of the Supreme Court every half-year, at a general gaol delivery, is the sole remaining trace of centralisation. When it is considered to what nice questions of law mineral property of this kind must give rise, it is most creditable to the Victorian community that they have extemporised a system of jurisprudence and procedure apparently well adapted to the circumstances of the case.

Such is the simple machinery by which law and order are preserved on the goldfields of Victoria. Nothing can well be imagined less officious or embarrassing to their occupants. Indeed, the Victorian goldfields are at present models of industry, order, and we may add, sobriety. The magnitude of the works into which co-operative societies of goldminers now enter, and the many lives which depend on the punctilious discharge of the duties assigned to each member, have brought about a condition of society in strange contrast to the excitement and violence of earlier years. The immense introduction, too, of machinery has contributed to this rapid change. The individual miner possesses less and less power. The inducements to form one of a co-operative company for deep-sinking or quartz-mining become greater every day. This, the Colonial Parliament has greatly assisted by its Mining Association Act—though the Act itself is capable of some further improvements. Hence, the goldminer has strong and increasing inducements to husband his savings. Heavy and expensive machinery, too, and the works which are now undertaken, extending over a

period of several years*, have obliged the goldminer to adopt a more settled mode of life. The deep-sinker and the quartz-miner have exchanged their tents for comfortable brick cottages; if married, they have 'sent home' for their wives and children, and a wealthy village, topped by the engine-house with its tall and handsome chimney, marks the site of some 'claim' which is expected to give remuneration for the capital expended on it for several years to come. The whole of the goldfields are now being thickly studded over with such villages; while each of the larger goldfields' towns is an independent municipality, under the Municipal Towns Act passed so early as 1854, and levies its own rates for improvements, water, lighting, &c. Some of these towns contain as many as 20,000 and 30,000 inhabitants, and possess public buildings far superior to those of English towns of equal population. In the words of the Parliamentary Papers before us: --- 'Their streets are well metalled and paved, lighted with gas, and supplied with water. Substantial edifices of brick or stone have replaced the original weather-board structures, and handsome buildings for all public purposes have been erected either by the government or the town council Nor are such improvements confined to the larger or older townships, for of the dozen minor ones through which I passed — Kyneton, Malmsbury, Tara-dale, Chewton, Inglewood, Tarrengower, Dunolly, Carrisbrook, Maryborough, Amhurst and Talbot, Clunes and Creswick — some not in existence when I last travelled that way, others not even yet incorporated — there were several quite on a par with what I recollected the chief goldfields' towns to have been.'† Railways of a very superior and permanent structure are in course of formation, to connect these towns with the metropolis. That to Ballarat has been already opened. Another to Mount Alexander, and thence to Bendigo, is almost completed; and the ground for several branch lines between the goldfields' towns themselves is already surveyed. The lines actually opened in the colony of Victoria, or on the point of being opened, amount to 351 miles. Though constructed at a heavy cost, averaging about 35,000*l.* per mile, there is little doubt but that they will return a fair interest on the capital invested, when sufficiently completed to assist each other. In the meantime, a large and remunerative passenger-traffic is conducted by fast and well-appointed American coaches throughout the whole of the Mining Districts.

* In some cases, it takes as many as four years to bore down to the auriferous stratum.

† Despatch of Sir Henry Barkly, Governor of Victoria.

The total number of persons residing within these six Mining Districts is given as 233,501, of which 90,364 are returned as directly employed 'in the extraction, by washing, crushing, or 'other mode, of gold.'* These latter, then, are the actual goldminers of Victoria, the remainder of the 'goldfields' population being made up of their wives and families and the host of followers who supply their necessities, comforts, and amusements. To the operations of these 90,364 goldminers we shall now entirely confine ourselves. For which purpose we shall select the two chief goldfields on which the two great branches into which goldmining has now separated—quartz-mining, and deep alluvial mining—have most extensively developed themselves. All the operations carried on in goldmining are, indeed, to be found on each goldfield, but as Bendigo is now the great seat of quartz-mining, as Ballarat has, from its discovery, been of deep alluvial mining, we shall ask the reader's attention to each in its turn.

Ballarat, situated on the culminating ridge of the main line of elevation, was the first goldfield opened within the colony of Victoria, and it cannot be without interest to examine the changes which eleven years of uninterrupted goldmining has had upon it and its surrounding district. The goldfield of Ballarat is the largest goldfield within the Mining District of Ballarat, to which it gives its name, and is itself the centre of a cluster of outlying goldfields— as Creswick, Smythe's, Egerton, Gordon, Steiglitz, Clunes, Linton's, Carnham, &c., destined, doubtless, in course of time, to merge into the goldfield of Ballarat. Its chief town, also called Ballarat, occupies the centre of the goldfield, and gold workings are actually conducted some 300 or 400 feet beneath its surface. Indeed, the gold workings of Ballarat interfere but little with the surface, and throughout the whole of the district cattle graze, and agricultural produce is grown over its most valuable and active goldmines. The town of Ballarat is, with the exception of Sandhurst (the chief town of the Bendigo Mining District), and perhaps, we might say of Castlemaine (the chief town of the Castlemaine, or Mount Alexander Mining District), with which it contests the palm, the largest town within the six mining districts. It has, of course, wholly sprung up within the last five or six years, the site of the Ballarat goldfield being

* 'Goldfields' Statistics,' issued from Mining Department of Victoria, 1862. By general census taken in April, 1861, we see that the total population of the colony of Victoria amounts to 540,322 souls. The population, therefore, is pretty evenly divided between the mining districts and the remainder of the colony.

at the discovery of gold an unexplored forest. It now contains some 5,000 stone, brick, and wooden houses, and several very superior public buildings. There are nine banks, all handsome stone buildings; upwards of a dozen places of public worship; a large and most excellently conducted public hospital, of immense importance where mining accidents are of such frequent occurrence; a very fine Mechanics' Institute and reading-room; a handsome and excellently arranged gaol and court-house; a town-hall, three theatres -- one a very handsome and commodious building with a good front to the main street; and an abundance of hotels. All the houses are supplied with gas and water, and rows of English cabs stand in the leading streets. Ballarat publishes two daily newspapers, which have a large circulation over the surrounding district. But the feature which particularly strikes the traveller on approaching the town is the number of pretty brick three-roomed and four-roomed cottages, with their neat gardens of clustering vines and roses, which absolutely luxuriate here, forming the outskirts of the town. Though distinct from the surrounding goldmines, the inhabitants of the town are deeply interested in goldmining speculations. The preliminary operations before the auriferous stratum can be reached and gold obtained, are tedious and expensive, requiring in most cases the erection of powerful and costly steam-machinery. Many of these works are commenced by companies of goldminers possessed of little capital. The excellent mining regulations of the district, to which we shall presently ask attention, have, however, given considerable security to such operations. A company in possession of a 'claim' on an established 'lead' is readily assisted by private individuals, and even by the banks, at the current rate of interest on good security. The storekeepers, too, are not unwilling to give credit for a year, and even longer, to shareholders in such co-operative companies. In this manner, the inhabitants of the town of Ballarat -- and, indeed, of all the goldfields' towns -- though taking no active part in goldmining operations, are closely associated with the surrounding actual goldmining population, whom, in their turn, they find to be liberal customers.*

* This goldfield produces about 8,000 ounces of gold per week, value 32,000*l*.¹, most of which passes through the hands of the store-

¹ Ballarat gold is reckoned the purest in the colony. At 3*l*. 17*s*. 10½*d*. per oz. for standard gold, Ballarat gold is worth, in reality, about four guineas per oz. There is, however, an export duty of half-a-crown, and freight and insurance further reduces it to 4*l*. per oz.

Mining operations on the Ballarat goldfield are carried on entirely by 'deepsinking'—the auriferous stratum being seldom found at a less distance than 300 or 400 feet below the present surface. What was the surface of the earth when the auriferous quartz-reefs were broken open and their contents distributed anew by ancient streams and watercourses, is known to the goldminer as 'the bottom,' or bed-rock,—a soft argillaceous schist, or pipeclay, the washings, doubtless, from the stratified rock, carried on for ages before gaps began to be formed in the quartz-reef. Over this floor the auriferous stratum, or 'washdirt' of the goldminer, is not distributed equably, nor in patches as on shallower goldfields, but in continuous channels, or 'leads.' Thus, while there are fair grounds for supposing that the shallower goldfields of the colony are the sites of ancient lakes, the slow action of whose waters, aided probably by atmospheric influence during seasons of drought, had disintegrated the upper parts of the quartz-reefs and deposited their auriferous detritus in the deeper portions of their beds—in a manner similar to the lacustrine deposits of the Ural, as described by Murchison—there is little doubt but that Ballarat and other deep goldfields owe their alluvial deposits to broad and powerful streams, whose beds, tortuous, meandering, continually breaking off into new directions and returning into themselves, even sending off branches which again return—like nothing save an Australian river of the present day—and now long buried beneath accumulating detritus, form the present 'leads.' When, however, the disintegration of the quartz-reefs had ceased, and their gaps, in common with the whole of the auriferous stratum now deposited, had become covered and protected from further change, by overwhelming accumulations of non-auriferous detritus from neighbouring heights and slopes, other operations of nature began. From various centres, reservoirs of molten basalt burst forth, spreading in wide floods over these leads, sometimes within a few inches of the top of the auriferous stratum—on Ballarat generally from six to ten feet thick—though never disturbing it, and sometimes one or two hundred feet above it, and separated from it by non-auriferous accumula-

keepers. This is, of course, exclusive of large and increasing agricultural and horticultural operations growing up around the gold-field, the soil being found of the most excellent quality.

* 'The 'ana-branch' is still a characteristic of the Australian river of the present day. A branch starts from the main channel without any assignable cause, traverses a large district, and again joins the stream at a lower portion of its course.

tions of sand, gravel, pebbles, and fragments of rock. When these floods cooled into an exceedingly compact and hard stone—known as ‘bluestone,’ and extensively used for building purposes throughout the colony—they, in their turn, became covered by non-auriferous accumulations from the surrounding heights and slopes, to be again overwhelmed by new floods of basalt bursting forth at new periods. In this manner we find auriferous leads, once broad and deep channels cut in the living rock, now buried beneath four and even six layers of basalt with their intermediate accumulations of non-auriferous detritus, and all trace of their course obliterated from the present surface of the soil. To add to these difficulties in ‘striking ‘a lead,’ the goldminer has also to contend with immense bodies of water which have percolated through the loose sand and gravel from the surrounding heights, and now lie stored between these alternate layers of basalt, and which pour in from all sides when a shaft reaches a water-level.

Under these circumstances, ‘deepsinking’ would be the most insecure of all mining speculations, but for a regulation which has gradually extended over all the goldfields, and is now embodied in an Act of the Colonial Parliament, known as the Frontage Act. The Frontage System may be thus briefly described. A lead being discovered—of which the discoverers are bound to give notice, or forfeit their right to an ‘extended claim,’—the Mining Surveyor, an officer under the Mining Board, records the name of the lead, and apportions their claim to the discoverers; its area depending on the depth of the lead from the surface and the number of associated miners in the party. The next associated company which applies for ‘Registration’ is entitled to Claim No. 2, and to no other. And so with Claim No. 3. In this manner some 50 or 100 claims are ‘registered,’ extending over several miles, before the holders of Claim No. 2. have begun to remove the first sod, or the future course of the lead is determined, save by the merest conjecture. These registered claims, therefore, have an existence merely on paper. And here the Frontage Act comes in. A claim under the Frontage System is bounded on two sides only—by two parallel straight lines distant from each other by the number of lineal feet allowed to the registered claim-holders,—on the other two sides the claims being left boundless until the lead is crossed. • In this manner, wherever a registered company may choose to commence their shaft, no new company can come between them and cut them off from the portion of lead to which they are entitled. Great care is taken to commence the shaft as near as possible to the actual course of the

lead — the process of 'driving for the lead' being the most tedious and expensive to which the goldminer is subject; but however great be the error, the intervening space is secured from all trespass. Such is the main feature of the Frontage System. Though exceedingly simple, it has, however, led to frequent and harassing litigation, and has, more than once, been sought to be upset altogether — it being denied that a boundless 'claim' was any 'claim' at all. The frequent crossing, branching, and junction, too, of leads have led to further confusion.

Having registered a claim, its holders generally wait until the lead has been traced up to within a short distance of them — the discovery of gold in each successive claim being announced by a flag placed over the mouth of the shaft. Having determined 'to commence sinking,' the claimholders choose a site for their shaft. A previous course of boring by means of iron rods generally affords some tolerable clue to a selection. The ancient streams, now known as leads, which hollowed out channels for themselves in the living rock, left banks composed of the same rock on each side of them. It is between these banks that the floods of basalt have, for the most part, flowed and hardened into solid beds; and though banks, basalt, and channels are now levelled over by later débris, the presence of a deep bed of basalt, ascertained by boring, is usually taken as a fair indication that the lead is not far off. A strong scaffold, some eight or ten feet high, is erected over the site of the shaft, to save the labour of carting the soil to a distance from the pit's mouth, and the sinking is begun. A rope and bucket, a rude windlass, and the ordinary miner's pick and shovel suffice until a layer of basalt is met. Then the pick and shovel are exchanged for blasting powder and the 'jumper.' When the layer of basalt, from 10 to 100 feet thick, is penetrated, the great expense begins. Torrents of water inundate the shaft. Steam machinery and powerful pumping apparatus have now to be effected. The various foundries established in Melbourne, and even on the goldfields, are, however, generally found willing enough to assist the holders of a well-situated claim on an established lead. The whole shaft must now be 'boxed,' to keep out the water. Strong planks of the blue gum — a wood almost as heavy as iron — some six inches thick, are formed into a water-tight frame all down the shaft, as the miner descends. 'The engine' is, however, the miner's great friend, and scarcely any deepsinking is now ever attempted without a powerful steam-engine. It keeps down the water, hauls up the buckets of soil and rock taken from the shaft,

lowers down the timber used for boxing, supplies the shaft and 'drives' with fresh air, and, when the auriferous stratum is reached, puddles, washes, and separates the gold from the wash-dirt.* It sometimes takes three, four, and even five years before the miner descends to the level of the lead, and, not seldom, overpowered by water, he is obliged to abandon his claim altogether.

When the level of the lead is reached, the great question is to determine in what direction the lead is. It may be north, south, east, or west of the shaft. Tunnels, or 'drives,' are, therefore, formed in various directions, all of which must be boxed, and supported by strong wooden pillars fitting closely to each other along the sides and roof of the drive, as well to keep out the water as to prevent the loose gravelly stratum from falling in.

Of the rapid extension of this description of goldmining we find further and interesting particulars in the Parliamentary Papers before us. Alluding to the geological researches of Mr. Selwyn, the Governor of Victoria writes:—

'In one class of alluvial digging, indeed, to which he was, I believe, the first to direct attention—the sinking through the trap-rock to the ancient watercourses which were covered late in the tertiary period by that volcanic eruption—I found the most extraordinary progress had been made since my former tour. It was then confined exclusively to Ballarat, except in a few instances, where hill-sides had been tunnelled on the Loddon and some of its tributaries [in the Castlemaine, or Mount Alexander, Mining District]—though it was predicted by the Mining Commission that gold would be found all the way to the Pyrenees, though it might be at a depth of several hundreds of feet. This is slowly being proved in the direction of Creswick and Clunes up to two remarkable volcanic hills, Mounts Greenock and Glasgow; but the operation of deep-sinking is tedious and requires a large capital, and it is only in the immediate vicinity of Ballarat that the results can be seen to advantage.

'As an example of what has been there accomplished, I may cite the case of the Great Extended Company on the Redan Lead, whose shaft I, at the invitation of the shareholders, all working miners, descended. It was begun in 1857, and before the solid rock was pierced, to the depth of 350 feet, three years and-a-half expired, and nearly 20,000*l.* had been spent in pumping-engines, timbering, &c.—without reckoning the value of the labour of the eighty shareholders, worth at least as much more. This outlay, great as it was,

* 'Goldfields Statistics' for the year ending 1861 set down the total value of steam-machinery on the Victoria goldfields at 1,411,012*l.*

has been richly rewarded, for in fifteen months from June 1860, when they "bottomed," as it is called, on the gold drift, 17,610 ozs. of the precious metal had been raised, valued at 70,442*l.*; and this, too, while they have been merely engaged in tracing the course of the "gutter," or bed of the former stream, which has been found as wide as 200 feet in the extreme point to which they have driven, which is about 1,500 feet from the base of the shaft. As each man, by the mining regulations, was allowed 50 feet along the supposed lead, the company has 4,000 feet to drive before they reach their next neighbours' boundaries, and it is supposed, therefore, that the claim will yield as well as hitherto for ten years to come. When it is considered that this company is but one of scores around it, all in different stages of progress — some down 500 feet, and not yet at the bottom — and that this underground treasury extends, in one direction alone, 70 or 80 miles, it will be clearly seen that however rapidly the surface diggings may be exhausted, these buried drifts will afford work for generations yet unborn.'

We shall now ask our readers to accompany us to the Bendigo goldfield.

Here we arrive at a totally new order of goldmining. Bendigo, the central and largest goldfield of the Sandhurst Mining District — its chief town, Sandhurst, being marked by the same rapid progress as the town of Ballarat — is about seventy miles from Ballarat on the north side of the Dividing Range, a line thither cutting the main axis of elevation at right angles. We pass, however, through numerous goldfields on our way, as Creswick, Yandoit, Crowlands, Fryer's Creek, and through the whole Mining District of Castlemaine. After which, we come to the borders of a large granitic area, stretching for twenty-five miles to the commencement of the Bendigo goldfield. The granite, however, barely comes to the surface, though the stratified rock has wholly disappeared, and the whole area is not higher than the surrounding country. The soil, chiefly formed from decomposed granite, is light and sandy, but forms good pasture land. Bendigo is, or was, a shallow goldfield. Its famous gullies, which yielded so many pounds' weight of gold to the tub, were scarcely a yard deep. The soil from these, however, has been literally cleared away — leaving the bed-rock exposed — and passed through puddling machines; whence it has issued in the form of 'sludge,' or liquid mud, large lakes of which may be seen in all directions, overwhelming gardens and cottages, and, though restrained by numerous Acts of the Colonial Parliament, threatening at several times to put a stop to all operations. Within these last few years, however, works in alluvial mining have extended considerably on the north side of the goldfield, where the bed-rock was found to

descend rapidly from the surface. Here, for twenty or thirty miles, this extension of the Bendigo goldfield is now being worked on a plan similar to that we have already described on Ballarat — the patchy, irregular, and unconnected auriferous stratum of Old Bendigo, which we must undoubtedly attribute to lacustrine deposits, here forming itself into distinct and continuous 'leads.' But it is on the Old Bendigo of 1851 that the chief goldmining activity is now concentrated. Here, on an area of some forty square miles, the solid rock is being burrowed like a rabbit-warren, and a thousand steam engines with their ponderous deafening quartz-stampers ply incessantly, day and night. There seems no reason to suppose that the auriferous quartz-reefs which traverse the stratified rock occur more frequently on Bendigo than on the other Victorian goldfields. More rich in the precious metal they certainly are not. But the very slight depth of the bed-rock from the surface, and the exposure, by the entire removal of the surface soil in alluvial mining, of the gaps worn by disintegration in the quartz-reef and its enclosing sandstone, led to the introduction of quartz-mining at an early period on this goldfield; and though this branch of goldmining is now rapidly extending over the whole of the auriferous region of Victoria and New South Wales, Bendigo still maintains its preeminence for quartz-mining.

At first, detached fragments of quartz lying about these gaps and on the surrounding heights where the reefs 'cropped out' and were exposed to disintegration from atmospheric action, were collected by the miner, and pounded by hammer. The great richness of these fragments soon led him to penetrate the reefs at these points, where it was found to descend, almost vertically, parallel with the stratification of the enclosing schists and sandstones. These researches soon led to the discovery that the reef also extended indefinitely on each side, though there might be no appearance of quartz on the surface, and though the exposed portion of the schist or sandstone might exhibit no trace of containing a quartz-reef. These quartz-reefs were found of all thickness, from a mere film to thirty and even fifty feet. In a vertical direction, their depth has hitherto been unascertained, and they would appear to descend without limit into the earth's crust. Their length, in a horizontal direction, is stated to be within more defined limits; though, as the top ridge of the reef descends rapidly from the surface, and 'claims' are seldom taken up on a reef after it has sunk a couple of hundred feet from view — from the great expense of boring down through the solid sandstone rock — the evidence on this point is unsatisfactory, and it has been even doubted whether a reef

stops at all within the bounds of auriferous elevation. Up to the present, six or eight miles is the longest distance to which a reef has been traced along the surface.

The richness of these quartz-reefs is of the widest and most uncertain character. Sometimes their upper portions only are found to be auriferous. Sometimes the miner meets no gold until he has removed one or two hundred feet of reef. The owners of one claim find a sudden fortune, while their neighbours on each side of them, on the same reef, are unable to meet a particle of gold. Sometimes, a reef along its whole extent is remarkable for its richness. More often, a whole reef contains no gold at all. Yet, notwithstanding these extreme uncertainties, the immense and rapid fortunes obtained by individual quartz-miners threw the whole of the colony some five years ago into an excitement fully as intense as that arising from the early discovery of its alluvial gold deposits. Melbourne did not, it is true, rush off to quartz-mining, but quartz-mining came down to Melbourne, and was virtually carried on in the offices of the Melbourne brokers and share-agents. Such a speculation, requiring the aid of powerful and expensive machinery, and where no gold could be secreted until it had passed through the stamping-mill and the furnace, seemed the most legitimate of all undertakings for large public companies employing hired labour. Dozens of glowing prospectuses issued daily from the brokers' offices; and at one time no less than 200 large public companies, representing a capital of over one million of money, might be counted in a colony then numbering less than half a million of souls. Doubtless, a good deal of this existed merely on paper; yet it is certain that no less than three-quarters of this sum, or 760,000*l.*, were actually paid up. Almost every man in the colony was a shareholder in some half-dozen quartz-crushing companies, and numberless were the instances where he had laid out all his spare cash in the purchase of shares for his children. Quartz-mining speculation was at its height when the publication of a new edition of Sir R. Murchison's '*Siluria*' again drew attention to the important question of the durability of these auriferous quartz-reefs, and induced a reconsideration of the subject. From that reconsideration, quartz-mining by means of large public companies has never recovered. Hitherto it had been assumed that a quartz-mine would be found to be inexhaustible; that it would preserve its auriferous character as it descended from the surface. But sufficient doubt has been thrown on the subject to deter the non-mining portion of the community from further speculation. Sir Roderick, who had long entertained and ex-

pressed the conviction that the yield of gold invariably decreases with the depth of mines, has candidly acknowledged in his last edition of 'Siluria' (p. 495.) that if the quartz-reefs yet untouched in Victoria should prove as rich as several now worked with good profit, the future supply of gold from them will continue to be very large. We are informed that from the machinery now applied to these operations, gold-crushing is found to be profitable in California, though no more than one *four-millionth* portion of the precious metal is obtained from the quartz.

In the meantime, the question which has at least hastened this reaction — for a reaction would certainly have come — remains unsolved. That the Australian quartz-reefs lose their auriferous character as they descend from the surface, has not been demonstrated, though in many instances it has certainly proved to be the case. To the statement that quartz-reefs in other parts of the world have been abandoned, it is readily answered that nothing like efficient machinery has ever been brought to bear upon them.* The scientific men of the colony almost unanimously agreed from the beginning with the view put forward by Sir Roderick Murchison. The practical

* 'No shaft has been sunk lower than 28 fathoms, and no perceptible change has been observed in the nature of the mineral substance at that depth; but owing to the influx of water and the want of steam, the works, at the period of our visit, were only carried on at a level of sixteen fathoms.' (*Sir R. Murchison's Russia and the Ural.*) What a contrast is here presented to the mining activity of Victoria, where a region as large as Scotland contains many thousands of shafts sunk to fifty and sixty fathoms in the solid rock, and all at present worked by steam machinery, performing *all* mining operations save the mere detaching of the 'stone' from the reef. Or, if contrast could be more marked, we may behold it in the rude barbarous system of goldmining carried on among the quartz-reefs in that portion of our vast gold-bearing system traversing South America, as described by Mr. Darwin in his '*Voyage of a Naturalist*:' — 'The mine is 450 feet deep, and each man brings up about 200 pounds' weight of stone. With this load they have to climb up the alternate notches cut in the trunks of trees, placed in a zigzag line up the shaft. Even beardless young men, eighteen and twenty years old, with little muscular development of their bodies (they are quite naked excepting drawers), ascend with this great load from nearly the same depth. A strong man, who is not accustomed to this labour, perspires most profusely with merely carrying up his own body. With this very severe labour, they live entirely on boiled beans and bread. They would prefer bread alone, but their masters, finding that they cannot work so hard upon this, treat them like horses, and make them eat the beans.'

quartz-miners, who have expended upwards of a million of money in expensive machinery, indignantly oppose it up to the present moment. Mr. Selwyn, indeed, the Government Geologist, whose duties led him to a more practical examination of the whole Victorian gold region, and who was inclined to take the same favourable view as the quartz-miners, has since somewhat modified his opinion. He is now willing to grant that there will be found a gradual decrease in richness with their descent from the surface. Mr. Belt, however, goes much further:—

‘In South America it has long been known that the upper parts of auriferous lodes are much richer than the lower. Many mines, once worked with great profit near the surface, are now abandoned as worthless. In Victoria, although a few mines might be pointed out, such as the “Mariner’s Reef” on Maryborough, and “Poverty Reef” at Sandy Creek, where rich deposits of ore have been found at a depth of from 200 to 400 feet, yet the general experience of mining enterprise must lead to the same conclusion. The opposite opinion, which was long held and encouraged in Victoria, led to the most mischievous results. Thousands of pounds were expended on lodes that had been rich at the surface, in the expectation that as rich, or richer, deposits would be met with at a greater depth. In nearly every instance the adventurers met with disappointment. Instances are innumerable of veins of quartz, highly auriferous in their upper parts, containing none of the precious metal below.’ (*Mineral Veins*, p. 24.)

To these statements of Mr. Belt, Sir Henry Barkly, in the papers before us, thus replies:—

‘That this condemnation is not always just, I had several opportunities of seeing; of which I will cite the first and most striking, which occurred at Castlemaine, where I descended the shaft of the “Ajax Mining Association,” and, at a depth of 150 feet, found the reef of very great richness, as the fragments which I knocked off proved. Now this was, a few weeks before, one of the most conspicuous failures under its then title of the Bolivia Reef Company; and, after a capital of some 12,000*l.* had been sunk, the whole plant and machinery were sold to a Melbourne firm for 1,500*l.* By them it was let, upon a tribute of 25 per cent. of the gold raised, to the actual workers, who had, when I visited it, taken out 10,000*l.* worth of gold exclusive of their then week’s work, which was nearly 500 ounces more. This mine was the first in the colony to be worked on the tribute system, which is, I believe, common in Cornwall; and I do not doubt that the result will be that the greater number of the abandoned or insolvent companies will yet be carried on to the benefit of the community, if not of the original shareholders.

‘In fact, the Mariner’s Reef, which he cites as an exception, was, for three years at least, closed from the second cause [influx of water]. Whilst the Poverty Reef had, so far back as 1858, been

suspected of declining when only 170 feet had been reached. Yet I saw, the other day, with my own eyes, stone raised from a depth of 500 feet on the former which yielded six ounces to the ton; and, on the latter, at double its former depth, I found the mouth of the shaft surrounded by a glittering heap of apparently far greater intrinsic value.'

But, whatever may be the durability of this auriferous region of Victoria, and whatever ultimate form its goldmining operations may assume, we have endeavoured to show that it is but a mere spur in a vast system of far greater magnitude; and it is not unreasonable to infer, from the prodigious discoveries of gold in the last few years, that the true extent of the deposits of that metal are still very imperfectly known. A more minute examination into the progress which has been made since the Californian discoveries of 1847, can scarcely fail to show that the new dwellers on and around these auriferous regions are neglecting none of the more lasting bounties of nature in their search for gold, but are laying—rapidly indeed, but not the less solidly—the foundations of great and prosperous empires. And whatever may be the ulterior consequences of the enormous increase of gold on the uses to which that metal has hitherto been applied, it cannot be doubted that this powerful agent is rapidly contributing to the diffusion of civilisation, knowledge, wealth, and population over the globe.

ART. IV.—1. *Original unpublished Papers, illustrative of the Life of Sir Peter Paul Rubens, preserved in Her Majesty's State Paper Office: with an Appendix.* Collected and edited by W. NOËL SAINSBURY, of Her Majesty's State Paper Office. London: 1859.

2. *Lettres inédites de Pierre Paul Rubens, publiées d'après ses Autographes.* Par EMILE GACFET. Bruxelles: 1840.

3. *Catalogue du Musée d'Anvers.* 2nd Edition. Publié par le Conseil d'Administration de l'Académie Royale des Beaux Arts. 1857.

IN the centre of the Place Verte, in Antwerp, stands the statue of Sir Peter Paul Rubens; in knightly dress, and with gallant bearing, it seems to be not only a successful portrait, or a happy impersonation of his proud and active life, but the presiding genius of that sunny square. There, where the tall gables rise above the waving limes, and the market-women rest to poise their brazen jars, the most musical of chimes from the

spire of the huge church of Notre Dame drop ever and anon upon the traveller's ears; and that traveller, as he loiters in the shade, or gazes at the painter's effigy, will remember that of all the European cities he has visited, there is hardly one not able as well as proud to show among its richest treasures of art, some picture from the hand of this citizen of Antwerp. But it is not only in this spot that Rubens makes himself felt; traverse the town in all directions, visit its churches, kneel by its altars, linger in its galleries, or bend over its tombs, and you will find that Rubens follows you wherever you go; that he comes before you in all shapes, now as an artist, now as a householder, now as a statesman, now as the friend and counsellor of those in whose hands lay not the fate of Antwerp only, but also the weal and woe of the whole Spanish Netherlands. It is with Rubens in these capacities that we now propose to deal, and we shall avail ourselves of the letters collected by Mons. Gachet, and the more recent labours of Mr. Sainsbury, in an attempt to portray the painter, if not in his habit as he lived, at least in the position which he occupied among his contemporaries.

Considered in this historical point of view, the figure of Rubens is not one to be lightly passed over. He was a great painter, but he was also a great man: a courageous, generous spirit, a keensighted politician, a scholar, and a gentleman. He was not nobly born, but he was very nobly bred; the founder of a famous school, the master of many pupils, and, at a time when republican tendencies were rife, and the tenets of a new religion prevailed, a loyal subject and a worshipper in the old faith. To describe him merely as the artist and the colourist is then to fall far short of the mark. Yet it is our misfortune to possess in English no biography of this man, worthy to take its place as a record of his life and a picture of his times. 'What can there be new to say about 'Rubens?'' was naively asked of Mr. Sainsbury, when he was about to throw a new and needful light upon an important part of Rubens' career. Much every way. Yet Mr. Sainsbury's volume, valuable as it is, is not history: it is only an addition to the materials for history; and these letters, like M. Gachet's collection, require to be digested, compared, and condensed before they could form a page of narrative. Continental literature, it must be remarked, is also far from being wholly satisfactory, whether the recent or the earlier biographies be consulted. Alfred Michiels' recent treatise on Rubens and the Antwerp school is accurate in facts and dates, but so far below contempt as regards its criticism and its style, that his readers are glad to throw it aside, and to return to Dr. Waagen

Of his memoir we have a translation by Mr. Noël, and Mrs. Jameson furnished an introduction to its pages which greatly enhances its value. Her notes are admirable: the result of long acquaintance with her subject, and with the laws of sound artistic criticism. But the memoir itself is written from too narrow a point of view; it is dry and technical in style, and it is incorrect in several details that regard Rubens' life, even in some which refer to his early education. Michel, whose *Life of Rubens* was published at Antwerp in 1771, romances on all points of genealogy and parentage; the most questionable of his statements he is believed to have borrowed from De Vigeano, as De Vigeano had previously accepted them from Van Parys, a descendant of the painter. The errors of these three authors Smit reproduced at some length in his book, '*Historische Levens Beschryving van Pierre Paul Rubens*;' so that the antecedents of the Rubens' family, as well as the curious circumstances under which Peter Paul was ushered into the world, were until lately more matter of fancy than of fact. The desire to claim for one who so ennobled himself a remote descent from a great house, was combined with no little ignorance of the truth. Thus Rubens was long declared to be the scion of a Styrian family, which, after the coronation of Charles V., came to establish itself in the Low Countries: but the archives of Antwerp, unluckily for the truth of this legend, have preserved a record of the sayings and doings of the Rubens' generations as far back as the year 1350; and from the time of the Arnold Rubens, who figures at that date as a tanner, to the birth of John, the father of the painter, the genealogy seems to have been one of those long 'pedigrees of toil' so common among the Flemings, and happily still so common among ourselves. This John, receiving a liberal education from his parents, went abroad to complete it, and took his degree as Doctor of Canon and Civil Law at the College of La Sapienza in Rome. He returned to his native country in 1561, and there, after his marriage to Maria Pypelinx, became a magistrate of Antwerp.

The years during which he held this post were troubled and anxious. In 1563, the Counts Egmont and Horn lent their support to the liberal schemes of William of Orange; and as the provinces of the Netherlands became the scene of an exhausting struggle for religious and political freedom, the city of Antwerp could not escape from the pressure of this disastrous war. No other city in the Low Countries suffered as much in its commerce and domestic interests. The heat of the two religious parties was fomented by its burgomaster Van Straalen, and the iconoclastic fury of 1566 showed to what a

pitch popular feeling had been excited. In thus blowing the flame of civil discord, Van Straalen had hoped that the citizens, in the strength of their frenzied patriotism, would prevail, and shake off the Spanish yoke. But in 1568 it became apparent that the Catholic party was in the ascendant; and when Egmont and Horn were led to the scaffold in Brussels, the chief magistrate of Antwerp paid at Vilvorde the penalty of his sedition. Years elapsed ere the beautiful mistress of the Scheldt could be restored to peace and populous plenty. Her quays, along which the flags of all nations had been wont to flutter, were deserted; the fires of persecution, lit by the Duke of Alva, blazed in her market-place, and his statue in the citadel reared its head over a submissive and a ruined town.

But from Antwerp, in the autumn of 1568, fled John Rubens. During the régime of Van Straalen he had shown a leaning towards Calvinism, which, whether the result of conviction or of prudential motives, earned for him the ill-will of the agents of Philip II. and the acquaintance of the Protestant princes. In this fatal year he had tried to retrieve his mistake by making a public protestation of allegiance to the government and to the Catholic faith: but the truth was that he had entered into correspondence with the Prince of Orange, and that fact, if divulged, would be fatal. It thus became necessary for him to retire to Cologne, already a city of refuge for many of his countrymen under similar circumstances.

Unluckily for John Rubens his relations with the household of William the Taciturn did not terminate with that letter to the Princes of Orange and Chimay which had been his undoing at home. He was again introduced to the notice of the Prince by the Councillor Jean Bets, and assisted that functionary in an endeavour to wrest from Philip of Spain, through the intervention of the Landgrave of Hesse and the Elector of Saxony, the dowry of Princess Anne, which His Catholic Majesty had confiscated in common with all the other revenues of her husband: and it was while engaged in this business that John Rubens had the opportunity of forming an intimacy with this Princess, as disastrous in its effects on his own fortunes, as it was disgraceful to the wife of William. For two years this intrigue, of which the scene was laid sometimes at Cologne, sometimes at Siegen, remained undiscovered, till in the spring of 1571 John Rubens was arrested and thrown into the prison of Dillenbourg. Had the Elector of Saxony been less anxious to conceal the misconduct of his daughter, it might there and then have fared very ill with the Doctor of La Sapienza, who, as it was, languished in

prison for two years, in spite of the generous and unremitting exertions of his wife. M. Bakhuizen Van den Brink has collected and published a volume of researches into the Life of Anne of Saxony; in which he praises the character and energy of Maria Pypelinx, and a résumé of her correspondence is to be found in his pages. Liberated at last from durance, but obliged to reside in the town of Siegen, and to find a security in 6,000 crowns for his continuance there, John Rubens obtained his release from prison under conditions sufficiently irksome. But the years wore on; and it was at Siegen that a son named Philip was born in 1574; and there also that on the 29th of June, 1577, Peter Paul Rubens saw the light. It is a curious fact that though these two children, the fifth and sixth of her family, were born in Nassau, so anxious was Maria to obliterate every remembrance of her husband's intrigue with Anne of Saxony, that she caused it to be inscribed on his tomb, that the nineteen years of his exile from his native town were all passed in Cologne—a statement which has given rise to the assumption that Cologne was the birthplace of the great painter. It is, however, true that in the same year in which he was born the death of the Princess (whose mental alienation had become complete before her demise), released William from the burden of an unhappy union, and removed the main cause for the restrictions imposed on the movements of her quondam favourite; thus the exiles obtained permission to return to Cologne, where John Rubens died in 1587, and where his house in the *Sternen Gasse* is still shown. Strangers are invited to believe that the 'Apelles of Germany,' as he is styled in the inscription, first drew breath within its modest walls; but the fact being disproved, they must content themselves with knowing that those low-roofed rooms were the last asylum of Mary of Medicis, and with imagining how the child Peter Paul played up and down the paths of the little garden of potherbs, which still lies behind the house. 'I have always liked Cologne; for I lived there till I was ten years old,' says the painter in one of his letters, and the last wish of his life was to revisit the town where his father is buried. This wish, however, remained ungratified, and Rubens never returned to the city which Maria Pypelinx quitted immediately after her husband's death. She intended to devote herself to the education of her children, and gladly reverting to her native place, she settled with them in Antwerp.

In that old city the fine arts had long had their home, and now that she has ceased to be the seat of government, or an emporium either of foreign trade or of native manufactures, she

is remembered, not so much for her old commercial renown, or for the two great sieges she has sustained, as for those illustrious sons of whose hands it may be told, as the proverb said of the workmen of Nuremberg, that they are known in every land. We lately had occasion in the pages of this Review to refer to the visit of Albert Dürer to Antwerp, for the double purpose of adding to his own knowledge, and of disposing of his prints and pictures in a society where art and artists were encouraged. From his curious diary we gained an insight into life as it existed in the Flemish capital in 1520. The great wealth of the citizens, which he mentions when describing the house, or rather palace of the then Burgomaster, the large amount of taxes freely paid by the burghers, the number of foreign merchants, the influx of Indian and Mexican manufactures after the conquest of Mexico and the establishment of a Portuguese settlement at Goa—all these are brought under our notice along with a general diffusion of the arts of music and painting, and with the presence of numerous and powerful guilds.

Of these guilds the most important was that of the painters. It had chosen for its patron that Evangelist, whom tradition declares to have himself handled the brush, and it occupied a conspicuous part in the industrial life of the city. It had a vast and extended influence in the Low Countries. It boasted of royal patronage and of ample funds; and we are indebted to the annals and records of this Brotherhood of St. Luke, which have recently been examined with great care, for several particulars of interest to the life of Rubens and to the history of the School of Antwerp. In those early days, when art was still religion, many of the occupations now esteemed purely mechanical were held to belong to it; thus the guild of St. Luke comprised not only the men of the palette and the brush, but, as we find from the franchise granted to its members by Burgomaster Van den Bruggen in 1442, it included sculptors, glass-blowers and stainers, illuminators, printers and engravers, book-sellers and binders, frame makers, carvers, gold beaters, founders of type, upholsterers, makers of playing cards, and other decorative trades. It is said that this corporation was founded by Philip the Good, and that it was endowed by Philip IV.; but however that may be, the earliest registers of the guild are lost, though from 1453, to the French invasion in 1794, they have been religiously preserved; and thus they have come down to us in three very curious books. The first, called the '*Liggere Van St. Lucas Ghilde*,' is a large quarto volume in manuscript, containing the names of all who were sworn into the renowned guild. '*Sires, deans, fathers,*

‘and ancients’ says its inscription, ‘do justly and give judgment after the judgment of Solomon; consider not persons in respect of rich or poor, but doing things seemly, maintain the laws of the city, and live in the peace of Christ.’ With the exception of the years 1541, 1562, 1563, 1565, and 1566, these registers are complete. The second book is the ‘Bussen ‘Bücklein St. Lucas Ghilde,’ and it preserves to us the rules adopted by the society, in regulating a fund for mutual help, which formed part of the constitution of this old ‘Trades’ Union; the third volume contains an exact account of the receipts and expenses incurred by the corporation, over the period of years before alluded to. Mainly to these original sources do we owe the correct biographical notices of the Flemish painters which enrich the new edition of the catalogue of the Antwerp Museum, published in 1857 by the Council of Administration for the Royal Academy of the town: a work which seems to us to possess all the qualifications that can recommend a catalogue, alike from its portable size, its legibility, and from the extreme care with which it is drawn up. The Memoirs have been rewritten, and the old errors which owed their rise to the works of Mander and Houbracken, among the old writers, and the more recent blunders of Immerzeel, have disappeared. M. de Laet, who had drawn up the first edition of 1849, associated M. Van Derius with himself in the compilation of the second, and he is the author of two-thirds of the biographies of this volume; but the name of M. Génard, as one of the members of the Commission, must not be overlooked; while in the matter of research and criticism, M.M. Alvin, Gachet, De Vignes, Siret, Léon de Burbure, and M. P. Visschers have succeeded to the old authors, and their researches into the authentic documents we have just described, reveal to us at this distant day the internal economy of the great Antwerp Guild. The Brotherhood of St. Luke still exists, and it looks back with pride to those great names which have won for it a European renown. The roll of its members records many patient scholars never known to fame: as for example, the Van Dycks; for of this name no less than twenty-seven sat in the painters’ chamber; Sir Anthony occurring as fourteenth on the list. On the other hand, to commemorate the celebrated masters in the guild would be to enumerate all that is greatest and best in the art history of the Low Countries; for the followers of this craft in Antwerp were no mere painters of *genre* or of low life, and the younger Teniers alone is distinguished for pictures of this class. They chose grave and elevated subjects, and they kept alive the heroic and the historical feeling in art. Many of them

were penetrated with religious feeling, and in their hands landscape-painting attained to a quaint yet remarkable degree of perfection. As prior to the period of Rubens, it will suffice to recall such painters as Jan Van Eyck, and Quintin Matsys. The latter became a member 1491-2, and must therefore have been one of the body who welcomed and feasted Dürer. The Nuremberg artist tells us of a visit he afterwards paid to Quentin in his house, but he has omitted to mention, (perhaps because the 'placens uxor' was so lamentably wanting in his own establishment,) whether this home was still adorned by the face of the beautiful Adelaide Van Tywlt, for whose sake the blacksmith had first become a painter, and for whom he served through many years, as Jacob served for Rachel in the pastures of Haran, when the world was in its spring.

Franz Floris, surnamed the 'Lantern-bearer and road-maker' of art in the Low Countries, with his pupil Martin de Vos, had kept up the reputation of the Brotherhood, but by degrees, a spirit less purely national had been creeping in among the painters of the Netherlands, and men like Mabuse, or Lambert Sustermann (Lamberto dei Lombardi) and many more, returned thoroughly Italianized in manner; since they had found in the schools of Italy a Capua for Flemish thought. The establishment of a Court at Brussels also damaged the interests of Antwerp as an art capital; but the guild had no lack of members, and it received into its body, in 1594, Othon Van Veen, (or, as he is oftener called, Otto Venius,) the master of Rubens. Van Veen was a man of cultivated mind and of great personal merit. By the Archduke Albert he was made Superintendent of the Finances of His Catholic Majesty; and among the burghers of Antwerp and Brussels he could boast of an almost royal descent, for his progenitor, John Van Veen, was an illegitimate son of Duke John III. of Brabant. But the blood that flowed through his veins was more true to the old Brabant race from which he descended, than the spirit in which he painted; for though we are reminded of his pictures in every street of a Flemish town that brings us face to face with its women and children, yet he too had an Italian education; at Parma he had learnt to copy and admire Correggio's 'pure and sovran grace,'* while he perfected his art under Zuccherò. He died at Brussels in 1629, after an active and a happy life which was prolonged to so ripe an age, that he held his children's children on his knees, and saw that pupil in the meridian of his fame, for whom it was reserved to bring about a thorough

* 'E di Correggio lo stile, puro e sovrano.'

restoration of national art in the Netherlands. Rubens entered his studio in 1596, having first served an apprenticeship with Tobias Verhaegt, a landscape-painter, and also studied under Adam Van Noort. With that master he had lived four years, that is exactly as many years as he afterwards lived with Venius; and it is curious that while he owed many of his peculiarities, and not a little of his excellence as a colourist to Van Noort, the graces of Venius made no impression on his mind: they were not congenial to him; already at nineteen years of age, the man, who afterwards made it his boast that he painted like a lion, had assumed an individuality of his own.

The early career of Rubens is matter of history: he entered the Guild of St. Luke in 1598, and he started for Italy in the spring of 1600. Sandraat is wrong in saying that he took an introduction from the Archduke Albert to the Court of Mantua: he owed his good fortune entirely to his own talents and address: but that the months passed there were among the happiest and the best employed of his Italian journey, we can easily imagine: for there he became familiar with the manners of courts, a natural element to the future diplomatist, and he was occupied in copying the most magnificent examples from Giulio Romano's hand; such pictures as the 'Marriage of Psyche,' and the 'Fall of the Titans,' leaving an indelible impression on his mind and style. He left Mantua on his first mission to Madrid, deputed by the Duke Vincenzio Gonzaga to Philip III., to take charge of some beautiful horses which were intended for the King, but secretly intrusted to convey a large Mantuan bribe to the hands of the then prime minister, the Duke of Lerma. From Madrid he went to Rome and next to Florence, where his portrait, drawn by himself, hangs in the gallery of the painters in the Uffizi; and he then seems to have repaired to Venice, to drink in colour in the school of Titian and Tintoret. It was from Rome, however, that he was finally summoned to receive the last breath of his mother; but Maria Pypelinx did not live to have her eyes closed by the hands of her son Peter Paul. After composing her epitaph and erecting a monument over her remains, the painter was disposed to quit Antwerp—he was ready to exchange the keen winds of the north seas, and the heathy levels of the Camphine, for the plains and terraces of that beautiful Italy which had already cast her spells upon him, when it appeared that though he had re-entered Antwerp as an orphan, he had re-entered it famous, and that the Archduke and Infanta Isabella would lose no time in persuading him to remain there, or to accompany them to Brussels. He yielded; and in the same year in which he attached him-

self to their train, he also made acquaintance with the family of Isabella Brandt; his marriage to her following shortly after, decided him to settle in Antwerp. In the street which bears his name, stands the house in which the rest of his life was spent; it was bought by him in 1611, and with the exception of the months occupied by his embassies into Spain and England, and by some other short journeys, there he dwelt—there the great pictures began to live under his hand—there passed the years of his happy union with the wife, of whom he said that she lacked all the faults of her sex, and there, when Isabella Brandt had gone to her rest, entered Helena Fourment in the fullness of her most beautiful youth; there he accumulated the antiques, the gems, the statues, the precious stones of his famous collection; there, according to his own boast, he coined gold with the palette and the pencil; and there in the ripeness of a good old age, this ‘prince of painters and gentlemen’ died.

We are accustomed to associate the idea of Rubens with a voluptuousness which was semi-barbarous, and with great luxury both of life and thought; yet his habits were anything but lax, and they were very far from being intemperate. We quote from Mr. Sainsbury:—

‘The person of Rubens is described to have been of just proportions; his height about five feet nine and a half inches; his face oval, with regular and finely formed features, dark hazel eyes, a clear and ruddy complexion, contrasted by curling hair of an auburn colour with moustaches and beard; his carriage was easy and noble, his introduction and manners exceedingly graceful and attractive; his conversation facile and engaging, and when animated in discourse, his eloquence, delivered with full and clear intonation of voice, was at all times powerful and persuasive.’

Such was the knight in person,—‘a valiant corpse, where force and beauty met,’ and this was his way of life:—

‘He rose early; in summer at 4 o’clock, and immediately afterwards heard mass. He then went to work, and while painting habitually employed a person to read to him from one of the classical authors (his favourites being Livy, Plutarch, Cicero, Seneca), or from some eminent poet. At this time he generally received his visitors, with whom he entered willingly into conversation on a variety of topics in the most animated and agreeable manner. An hour before dinner was always devoted to recreation, which consisted either in allowing his thoughts to dwell as they listed, on subjects connected with science or politics, which latter interested him deeply, or in contemplating his treatment of art. From anxiety not to impair the brilliant play of his fancy, he indulged but sparingly in the pleasures of the table, and drank but little wine. After working again till evening, he usually, if not prevented by business, mounted a spirited Andalusian horse, and rode for an hour or two. On his return

home, it was his custom to receive a few friends, principally men of learning, or artists, with whom he shared his frugal meal (he was the declared enemy of all excess), and he passed the evening in instructive and cheerful conversation.'

Of horses, indeed of animals in general, he was passionately fond; and that inanimate nature was not without its charms for his stirring and active genius, may be seen from his landscapes. Take, for example, that known as the 'Rainbow,' the 'Prairie de Laeken,' the woodland in the 'Atalanta and Meleager,' at Madrid, or the fine piece of country supposed to represent the environs of his own château of Stein, now in the National Gallery, where every detail is elaborated with the greatest care,—the pastures stretching away in the morning sun—the openings in the woods,—the waggoner at his tasks,—and the stream half hidden, half defined, by the pollard and brookside willows. In his taste for planting and building, his love of animals and his sympathy with them, some critics have found that he resembled Sir Walter Scott, while a curious contrast has been also pointed out between him and Fuseli. The one heated his brain by debauchery, and then produced pictures which might have been the work of a monk of the Desert, half crazed by solitude and abstinence; the other, who was careful even in meats and drinks, was apt to paint like a voluptuary and a libertine. Rubens was an honourable, but not what we should call an earnest man; he is never pathetic, never tender, often fierce, occasionally vulgar, sometimes sublime. His was not the imaginative, the saintly, or the meditative genius; action was his forte, life was strong in him, and owing perhaps to his happy and perfect physique, he was never morbid and never discouraged: his work, when it came complete from his hands, never seemed to him to be but the poor caricature of his conceptions—on the contrary it fulfilled them. His were 'the instinct, the presage, the strong propensity and the genial 'power of nature,' which, Milton tells us, led him to the writing of his great epic; but his was not the 'hallowed fire' which the poet sought.* If some of his religious pieces are treated with reverence as well as power, at other times it would almost seem as if 'things human had prejudiced things Divine.' It was no small achievement to succeed, as he did, in animating the colossal forms of his own canvass; and though it be not the highest, or the ideal side of our nature which he represents, he sins oftener from a redundancy of power, than from coarseness of thought. It is singular that with his strong sense of truth and realism, he should have devoted so much of his time to the frigid allegorical compositions of the age. But even in this

branch of art he outstripped all other painters, both of his own and of any former age. His processions move before us with a pomp of circumstance and of colouring that makes them positively glorious; a more accurate acquaintance with the events by which most of these allegorical compositions were suggested—as for example his ‘Peace and War’ painted for Charles I., and now in the National Gallery of England—invests them with a living historical interest.

The ferocity which appears in some of his works is as great and lawful a cause for distaste as their occasional grossness; it is even more surprising, for Rubens was a humane man, cautious, diplomatic, and reasonable in his words and deeds; he was kind to his inferiors, generous to his rivals, tender to his boys, and except when suffering from the gout he was evenly disposed towards all men and things: his charities were unbounded, and he enjoyed through all the years of his life the blessings which are said to wait upon the man who considereth the poor. Yet not only are his hunting pieces savage, but an absolute delight in representing pain meets one in his pictures. Not to speak of that terrible ‘Scourging of our Saviour,’ at Antwerp, or of the ‘Martyrdom of St. Lievin,’ we have but to look at the ‘Brazen Serpent,’ in the National Gallery: how much have we here of the pain, the fever, and the contortions of the wounded and dying: how small is the effect he gives to the supreme means of cure, offered to a writhing and gasping crowd! In the same way his ‘Great Judgment,’ at Munich, appeals to horror rather than to awe: and that colossal canvass (18 ft. by 14 ft.), crowded as it is with feats of drawing and foreshortening, is the strangest example of how far Rubens could at once succeed and fail. The weakness of the principal figure strikes every one, even at first sight. The two angels, on the right, are handled with depth and fire; and their beautiful but terrible faces are instinct with the wrath of God, which flashes from their eyes, as their keen glaives thrust in and out without rest. Beneath them is the mass of the damned, of which one, the figure in the extreme background, is the most imaginative conception in the whole work. The action of the lower half of the piece is in the throes of a creature, whom demons hurry off to Tophet: while upwards, on the left, presses the crowd of the redeemed, painted with such strong carnations and reflected lights as only Rubens could produce; and at the sound of the Angels’ trumpets the graves below are seen to give up their dead. Yet in spite of this furnace of colour and marvellous combination of extreme action, this great picture has no truly supernatural character, and the

sense of Heaven and Hell have both been strangely missed : for the pangs and the terror are corporeal rather than mental, the power from above terrific, but not divine.

In his pictures of women Rubens was curiously unequal. Some of them inspire both aversion and regret, others again are exceedingly noble and stately, although the Flemish type be one which does not admit of the tenderest refinement. In 'The Virgin being taught to read by St. Anna,' which hangs in the Antwerp Museum—the girl in her white lustrous robe, is both delicately imagined and beautifully painted, and the remembrance of those shy and maiden glances is not easily effaced. Beautiful, too, is the Magdalene, among 'The Four Penitents,' at Munich; and still more so is the St. Theresa, pleading with eloquent eyes and hands for the souls in Purgatory; while, in quite another style, nothing surpasses the 'Chapeau de Paille,' and the lady (said to be Isabella Brandt) in the great 'Wolf Hunt' of Lord Ashburton's collection. How well she sits her horse at her husband's side; and they seem, as they ride together out over the breezy downs, with the great white clouds rolling overhead, and the hunted creatures at their feet, to have been truly some Lord and Lady of La Garaye of Flemish life! The horse in this hunt (or, as Rubens would have called it, 'Caccia,') is magnificent; and Rubens was never more happy than in painting the animal he loved; unless, indeed, when he gives us a group of joyous children, dragging after them some great garland of fruit and flowers; a branch of his art which one must see the 'Seven Boys,' at Munich, in order to appreciate and admire.

The rapidity—we had almost said the haste—with which this master worked, is astounding: and no other man, even with the help of his scholars, could have given upwards of 1,300 pictures to the world, between the ages of nineteen and sixty-two. It is said that he generally worked standing, and that his hand was so firm as not to require to be steadied on the maulstick: it also was his practice to draw the design upon the canvass himself, and then to hand a finished sketch to his pupils, who were trusted to bring the picture into such a state that it was ready to receive its finishing touches: moreover he often left his colours for time and distance to blend; as strokes of pure blue, yellow, and red will recur side by side without any attempt made to mix them; but even allowing for the despatch of all these methods, it is almost incredible to believe what we are told, that the 'Offering of the Wise Men' (in the Grosvenor Gallery) was completed in eleven days, for it contains thirteen figures over life size: the artist, it is added, asked and received only 100 francs per diem for his labour. Copies of his own

works on different scales frequently occur, and few of his pictures are more interesting than his finished sketches. The twelfth cabinet in the Pinacothek, at Munich, contains some most beautiful examples of this sort; and we have nothing better in England than the two small editions of the 'Rape of the Sabines,' and the 'Interposition of the Sabine Women,' now in Bath House, and formerly the property of Mr. Danoot, the banker, in Brussels. There is nothing of Rubens' more characteristic than one of the groups which he has placed in the right-hand corner of the last of these two. We fancy that the woman, now a Roman wife and mother, recognises in the soldier upon whose shield she has thrown herself, a relation of her own — perhaps the shield itself was a familiar object to her childhood's eyes — but in all this she can now see nothing but danger threatening the life which had become a part of herself; and while another woman, in the thick of the fray, checks a fiery and eager horse, she has flung herself upon the Sabine, with a mixture of frenzy and intercession, passion and despair, that has never been excelled.

No one ever tired of admiring those paintings which are transcripts of Rubens' domestic life — from the first picture of Isabella Brandt, given to her in the heyday of their courtship, to that great family piece, which, in his own chapel in St. Jacques, commands the graves of his household, they are all pleasing; and we need hardly recall their features, so familiar are the outlines of the 'Going to Market,' and the beautiful brows of Helena Fourment, to all who have any knowledge or pleasure in art.

The time of Rubens' life which was the happiest was the most domestic, and it was also the greatest period of his painting; his style, as vigorous as it was ever to be, was more chaste than at a later stage; and such works as the 'Rape of Proserpine' (at Blenheim), and the great 'Descent from the Cross,' date their execution from this epoch. The story of that dispute with the Company of Arquebusiers to which this great work owed its origin, M. Gachet shows to have been no legend. Van Hasselt details at some length, and with no little *naïveté*, how, in laying the foundations of his house and museum, Rubens trenched on some ground belonging to the neighbouring guild; and as the then burgomaster, Rockox, happened to be head of the corporation, Rubens had no chance of appropriating it with impunity; but the painter compounded with them, so that he was allowed to build upon the site in question, provided he would paint for the company a picture of their patron, St. Christopher. In due time he presented them

with the 'Descent from the Cross,' and the two beautiful panels on the wings. The Arquebusiers declared they were deceived, and there was no St. Christopher in the picture, though there had been one in the bargain with the fraudulent artist! 'There are three,' retorted Rubens; and in truth, taking for his motive the etymology of the saint's name (*Χριστου Φερέιν*, or Christ-bearer), he had given them three representations — the blessed Virgin bearing her yet unborn Son; Simeon carrying in his arms the Word made Man; and, in the great picture itself, the Dead Christ supported by His disciples. But the Arquebusiers were first obstinate, and then angry; and Rubens, to pacify them, painted on the outside a gigantic image of St. Kitts, adding a hermit with a lantern and an owl, to show that the time represented was the night, when, according to the legend, the saint heard a little child summon him, saying, in a sweet treble voice, 'Christopher, come forth, for thou must carry me over to-night.' The hermit is supposed to be a spectator of the scene, when the giant staggers through the torrent, with the small but heavy burden on his shoulder; but the owl, we are assured by some, was a piece of malice intended to typify the extreme dullness of the masters of the worshipful Company. After perils by time, perils by soldiery, perils by travel, and perils by cleaning, it now hangs in the south transept, the head and crown of the glory of the great Notre Dame of Antwerp. 'The bridled power and 'imagination of this work,' says one of his critics, 'is beyond all praise,' and yet it is the reality of it which is most overpowering; the accessories are so fine, the whole so surpassingly painted, that we cease to think of it as a painting — our attention is centred in that mangled Form which, slack in limb and death-stained in face, slips from the cross; while we gaze, we feel that we are carried back to the dimness of that evening-hour when, to those weeping women hope seemed lost with life. We are told that the design is not original, and that it was derived from an Italian print. Granted that the position and grouping of the figures may have been copied, though this itself has never been proved, the master has thrown his whole strength into the idea; and the marvel and master-stroke of the piece, the linen cloth on which the light is concentrated, was Rubens' own invention, and adopted by him, in spite of the greater difficulty that its brilliant white must have imposed upon him in working up the flesh tints. Well might the triumphant genius say, 'Everyone according to his gifts. My endowments are such that I have never wanted courage to undertake any design, however vast in size or diversified in subject.'

Meantime Rubens grew in the estimation of Europe, and in favour with the Archduke and the Infanta. The Princess, besides consulting him on matters of state, honoured him, it is said, with a visit in his house, and saw his celebrated collection before it was broken up, and sold to the Duke of Buckingham, whose agent, Le Blond, purchased it for 100,000 florins. In this repository there were 19 pictures by Titian, 13 by Paul Veronese, 3 by Raphael, 3 by Leonardo da Vinci, 8 by Palma, 21 by Bassano, and 17 by Tintoretto, besides 13 by the householder himself, whose tastes seem to us to be wonderfully illustrated by the numbers of his pictures, and by the evident favour in which the Venetians were held. Of the thirteen original pieces mentioned, a curious and minute account is to be seen in Brian Fairfax's '*Catalogues of the Pictures in the Possession of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham.*' Among these canvasses, among statues and antiques of all sorts, we can imagine the Infanta Isabella wending her stately steps, and Rubens' courtly smile, as he led her from one picture to the other, or heard the Archduke offer to stand sponsor to the painter's child. This was the son Albert, whom Rubens commended, during one of his absences, to the care of his friend Dr. Gevaerts—a man fitted in every way for the trust, for Antwerp had no citizen more worthy than this secretary, John Gaspar Gevaerts, the philosopher and historian of Brabant. Thus Rubens wrote from Spain:—

'I entreat you to put my little Albert as my image not in y^r oratory, nor y^r infirmary, but in y^r museum. I love that child, and I recommend him to you in a serious manner, to you the chief of my friends, the priest of the Muses, to take the greatest care of him, both while I live and after my death.'

We anticipate a little by giving this trait of the artist; and our business is rather with the year 1620, when he was introduced by M. de Vicq to Mary of Medicis. The Queen Mother had just concluded a peace with her son, and being now occupied with the task of adorning the palace of the Luxembourg, it was suggested to her that the Flemish artist was the most fitting person to furnish her with a series of pictures, which should set forth her life and experience, and form an appropriate decoration for the gallery of the pile which Jacques de Brouse had just finished. Rubens went to Paris to receive her orders, and to take sketches for the twenty-five pictures. He then returned to Antwerp, and, in the space of two years, completed nineteen of these remarkable designs, by the help of his pupils or assistants. There were in his atelier at that time, students no less distinguished than Antony Van Dyck, Franz Snyders, and

Jacques Jordaens; while the numbers were made up by Justus Van Egmont, Peter Van Mol, Cornelius Schut, Jan Van Hoeck, Simon de Vos, Daodato Delmont, Mompers, Wildens, and Nicholas Van der Horst. The two largest of his canvasses were not painted till after his return to Paris, where he superintended the placing of the series, and he then conducted the Queen Mother into the gallery, and displayed to her the finished work. So highly allegorical were the compositions, that, it is said, Mary of Medicis was occasionally at a loss to conceive what were the circumstances in which she was represented, and, above all, who were the personages by whom she was surrounded; but the courtly painter managed to put her in possession of the required information, and fresh orders soon came to reward him for the flattery and the pains he had bestowed. Mary of Medicis might well be pleased with her own figure, where she is represented, fair and young, as disembarking at Marseilles, while Fame flies to publish the charms of Henry's Tuscan bride, and the jealous naiads rush to sink the boat that holds too beautiful a rival. These naiads, or syrens, as Rubens calls them, were, it seems, studied from three dark beauties of the day; for a curious little extract from one of his letters gives us the following:—

'To M. de Chennièvres.

'I beg of you so to arrange for us that there may be retained for me, in the third week which follows this one, the two ladies Cassaio, from the Rue du Vertbois, and also that little niece Louisa, for I reckon on making three studies of Syrens, and these three persons will be to me of great succour and infinite help; much by reason of the expression of their faces, but still more on account of their magnificent black hair, which I should have difficulty in meeting with elsewhere; the same with their figure.'

Another letter of Rubens, in his correspondence through M. l'Abbé de St. Amboise with the Queen Mother, relates to a desire she had expressed to have a second gallery of pictures resembling her own, to record the exploits of Henri Quatre. Two difficulties seem to have been in the way—first, that the widow could not decide upon the choice of subjects; secondly, that after Rubens had made some sketches for the plan, the proportions of the rooms were altered, and, as he said, would 'cut the head off the King's figure as he sat in his triumphal car.' This was very severe; and he soon made his plaint heard. 'He had,' he wrote, 'ruled himself after the first directions, and was well advanced with the most important pieces, such as the Triumph and the Ceiling; and now M. l'Abbé is going to take two feet off the height of my canvasses, hoisting up the frontispieces, and piercing the pictures with doorways, so that I

'have no remedy, and am obliged to lame, and spoil, and change all that I had done.' The gallery never made much further progress: the sketches already done found their way to Florence, and Rubens resented the whole affair. It must be added that the Queen Mother was also dilatory in her payments, and that the artist was disgusted with this trait of parsimony in her character, or poverty in her exchequer. 'I am sick of this Court,' he wrote, while the remuneration for his great work in the Luxembourg was still unpaid; 'and it might easily happen that I did not return to it again in a hurry.'

A further experience of Courts, however, awaited Rubens; and his favour with the Infanta appears since the death of the Archduke, in 1621, to have been on a firmer footing than ever. But in the middle of all this power and prosperity, a shadow fell upon the house, and ere he was perceived, the herald with the inverted torch had already delivered a summons at the gate. Isabella Brandt sickened and died; and in the summer of 1626, she was buried, in the same church where seventeen years before she had received the painter's troth. This, the 'excellent companion' of Rubens' best years, left him two sons; both of whom were educated at the feet of Dr. Gevaerts. But the master, like the parent, outlived the pupils once so tenderly recommended to his care; and it was not by the offspring of his first marriage that Rubens was to be represented to posterity. Nicholas, the younger, lord of the estate of Ramuyen, died first, and Albert, who was some time Secretary to the Privy Council of Flanders, expired in 1657, having survived his wife, and a son who was the only issue of their union.

On Isabella's death Rubens left Antwerp, and repaired to Holland to recruit his health under the kind offices of such friends as Polenberg, Sandraat, and Hontrost. In their painting rooms he found fresh interest for his mind and heart; and he left, says Mr. Sainsbury, with every artist whom he visited some proof of his friendship and of his love for the arts. He bought and he valued the works of his contemporaries and of his scholars, and upwards of eighty pieces by modern masters alone, were found in his possession at his death.

The scene of Rubens' life which now opens before us, is that which Mr. Sainsbury has best succeeded in elucidating. Nothing can exceed the patience he has shown in preparing this valuable collection of letters. Some of them had been made public in M. Gachet's book; others brought to light by the additional matter in Carpenter's *Life of Sir Anthony Van-dyke*: but the transactions in which Rubens was engaged as an ambassador were never known as they now are by the trans-

lation of this correspondence, which, drawn from the vast mine of Her Majesty's State Paper Office, has been collated, compared, and enriched by Mr. Sainsbury, with such brief and exact notes, that the reader, supplied with all the information that he can require, feels as he unrolls these curious records, how much he is indebted to the care and energy of the editor. The letters contain a curious mixture of the details of business with touches of character and of art. Those which refer to the sale of Rubens' collection, and those which passed between Toby Mathew and Sir Dudley Carleton about several commissions for hunting pieces, are abundantly interesting. Another letter is a good specimen of Rubens' way of concluding a bargain; it contains a list of twelve pictures then in Rubens' house, and which the painter priced at six thousand florins. The first of these is the Prometheus, the second is the Daniel in the Lions' Den, so well known from copies and engravings, now the property of His Grace the Duke of Hamilton, and which it seems was given by Sir Dudley Carleton to Charles I.: Rubens said of this himself, when giving its proportions, 8 feet by 12, that the lions were drawn from the life, and that the whole was painted by his own hand. This document is translated from the Italian, the language in which Peter Paul most frequently wrote, and in which, strange to say, he made his signature — 'Pietro Paulo 'Rubens' being appended to letters either in Flemish or in French. His Latin letters are signed 'Petrus Paullus Rubenius:' sometimes only with his initials, as 'P. P. Rubens,' while 'P. Rubens' only occurs in one place. It certainly is a curious fact which M. Gachet has established, that no French or Flemish signature of Rubens' exists; and it is perhaps an equally strange one, that the town of Antwerp does not possess a single autograph letter of the greatest master of her school.

It would appear that his pictures did not always give satisfaction to the patrons who ordered them. Thus, Mr. Locke to Sir Dudley Carleton:—

* Westminster: March, 1620.

'I have delivered the picture to my Lord Danvers; he made a motion to have me write to Rubens before he would pay the money to this effect. That the picture had been showed to men of skill, who said it was forced and slighted, and that he had not showed his greatest skill in it, and from that cause My Lo: would have him make a better if he could, and he should have this again . . . I told my Lo: that I knew your lordship had taken all possible care about it, and that I doubted not but that it would prove as good as it should be; but notwithstanding, that I would write to your lordship, to the effect of his lordship's speech.' . . .

Lord Danvers took care also to make himself heard, and he is very explicit:—

' To Sir Dudley Carleton.

May, 1621.

' My Lord Ambassador. . . . But now for Rubens. In every painter's opinion he hath sent hither a peece scarce touched by his own hand, and the figures so forced as the prince (Charles, Prince of Wales) will not admitt the picture into his Gallery. I could wish, thearfore, that the famus man would doe some one thinge, to register or redeem his reputation in this howse, and to stand among the many excelent wourkes which ar hear of all the best masters in Christendoom, for from him we have yet only Judeth and Holifernes, of littell credite to his great skill; it must be of the same bigenes to fitt this frame, and I will be well content to showte another arrow, of allowinge what money he may ask in exchaynge, and theas Lions shall be safely sent him back for tamer beastes better made. In y^r own busines you will receave satisfaction from such as ar more able to informe you, yet is thear no man more affectionate to doe y^r Lo : servis than, H. Dāvers.'

Notwithstanding this difference of opinion, Rubens was the artist selected to paint the decorations for the new Banqueting House at Whitehall in 1621, as we see from the following:—

' Peter Paul Rubens to W. Trumbull.

Antwerp, Sept. 1621.

' Sir,—I am quite willing that the picture painted for my Lord Ambassador Carleton be returned to me, and that I should paint another hunting peece less terrible than that of the Lions, making abatement as is reasonable for the amount already paid, and the new picture to be entirely of my own hand without admixture of the work of any one else, which I will undertake to you on the word of a gentleman. I am very sorry that there should have been any dissatisfaction on the part of Mons^r. Carleton, but he would never let me understand clearly, though I often entreated him to do so, whether this picture was to be an entire original, or merely one touched by my own hand. I wish for an opportunity to put him in a good humour with me, although it should cost me some trouble to oblige him. I shall be very glad that this picture be located in a place so eminent as the Gallery of H. R. H. the Prince of Wales, and I will do everything in my power to make it superior in design to that of Holofernes, which I executed in my youth. I have almost finished a large picture entirely by my own hand, and in my opinion one of my best, representing a Hunt of Lions; the figures as large as life. It is an order of my Lord Ambassador Digby, to be presented, as I am given to understand, to the Marquis of Hamilton. But as you truly say, such subjects are more agreeable, and have more vehemence in a large than in a small picture. I should very much like the picture for H. R. H. the Prince of Wales to be of the largest proportions, because the size of the picture gives us painters more courage to represent our ideas with the utmost freedom and semblance of reality. I am ready under any circumstances to employ

myself in your service, and recommending myself humbly to your favour, offer myself at all times to your notice.

‘As to His Majesty and H. R. H. the Prince of Wales, I shall always be very pleased to receive the honour of their commands, and with respect to the Hall in the New Palace, I confess myself to be by a natural instinct, better fitted to execute works of the largest size rather than little curiosities. . . .

‘Sir, yr very humble servant, .

‘PETER PAUL RUBENS.’

Rubens’ next acquaintance with England and the English Court was to be not artistic, but diplomatic. The widowed Infanta was anxious to bring about a suspension of arms between the Sovereigns of Great Britain, Denmark, and Spain and the United Provinces, and Balthazar Gerbier, himself a painter, was desired by the omnipotent Buckingham, whose agent he was, to treat with Rubens, selected by the Infanta as the fittest person to negotiate on her part. Mr. Sainsbury translates and gives in full the memoranda of the various discourses held between these two agents. Gerbier’s letters are in obscure and peculiar French; and his speech seems to have been embellished with many flowers of the rhetoric then so fashionable. Rubens, though more explicit in his statements, indulges in similar adornments, ‘and,’ says Gerbier, ‘wrote frequently to me deploring ‘the present state of affairs, wishing to revive the Golden Age, ‘and conjuring me to make the Duke of Buckingham understand the Infanta’s great regret that affairs were in their present ‘state. The Sieur Rubens, enlarging on this point, said how ‘praiseworthy and advantageous this work of reconciliation ‘would be. He believed it easy of accomplishment, provided ‘the King of Great Britain would lend a favourable ear, and ‘the Duke was well disposed, so that *his* assistance might be ‘relied upon. Then Rubens dwelt strongly on Spain being ‘willing to listen to reasonable conditions; and much more to ‘same effect.’ In reply to all this, the following was meant to be conclusive:—

‘*B. Gerbier to P. P. Rubens.*

‘Brussels, 1627.

‘To Mons. Rubens,—My Lord the Duke of Buckingham has commanded me to inform you with respect to the discourses we have held, that if it pleases the Infanta to obtain full powers from the King of Spain to treat in his name and on his behalf with the King of Great Britain, for a general suspension of arms (withdrawing the armies), between the King of Spain, the King of Great Britain, the King of Denmark, and the States-General of the United Provinces, that he will do his best to carry into effect the resolutions and wishes of the several parties for the suspension of arms for two, three, four,

five, six, or seven years, restoring commerce to its original footing as in times of peace, during which time an accommodation may be treated for. B. GERBIER.'

All this time Spinola was on the Flemish coast, and seems not to have ratified the power of the Infanta's new diplomatist till this same month of February, 1627; when the negotiation proceeds. With regard to the Dutch Provinces, it was said on behalf of the Infanta, that:—

'Every one cannot but think that there will be very great difficulties with respect to the title of free states, which they pretend to be applied to them in the truce; but which title is so contrary and repugnant that he, the King of Spain, wages war for no other reason. For if he had chosen to consent to this title, the Dutch would never have made, nor would they at present make any difficulty, in continuing or renewing the truce as before, as Rubens testifies, who has been employed in this business. . . . But leaving the Dutch to insinuate this title during the suspension of arms, the King of Spain would perhaps be found willing to treat subsequently with them for a lasting peace, under honourable conditions to His Majesty, and without prejudice to their liberties. . . . It is certain that it would be thoroughly appreciated in Spain and by Her Serene Highness, if the King of Great Britain would interpose his authority and goodwill to this accommodation.'

Endless were the letters and messages exchanged on this subject. Rubens, for furtherance of the affair, repaired to Breda, but by August of the same year it would not seem that they had advanced much beyond the preliminaries; the following is extracted from a letter written to the Elector of Cologne from Spa, at that time:—

'It seems that the treaty of which the Sieur Rubens laid the foundations advances little by little, and that his journey from Holland, from whence he returned some days past, having been called there by Ambassador Carleton, has also given an impetus to it. This opinion is confirmed by the arrival in this place of the Sieur de Montagu, an Englishman, who had no sooner arrived yesterday than he sought out the Marquis Spinola. . . . This Rubens above mentioned is the principal painter of Antwerp, who sold for 100,000 florins antiquities to the Duke of Buckingham; and while this purchase, which took some time, was being made, this negotiation it appears begun.* Montagu is a young English lord greatly favoured by Buckingham. Several are of opinion that it is to maintain good friendship and correspondence between the Spaniards and English, and some add that France will be included; but there is

* Walter Montagu, son of Henry, first Earl of Manchester, better known as the Abbé de Montagu; he was made commendatory Abbot of Pontoise by Louis XIV.

little appearance of that, inasmuch as your Highness will have heard elsewhere the English have made a descent in the Isle of Rhé, where they are still fighting; but since Rubens and Montagu have come from Holland, I am inclined to believe that in these treaties the Hollanders will most probably be comprised, and perchance the Palatine also.'

So the business slowly proceeded, with an expenditure of time and ink, beyond precedent and beyond measure; till Don Diego de Mexia arrives from Spain, with much to learn of the nature of the matter in hand, and Rubens then writes to Gerbier:—

'The answer which I herewith send you (Sept. 1627) is all that can be done in this conjuncture. We believe that these Leagues will be like thunder without lightning, which will make a noise in the air without producing any effect, for it is a compound of divers tempers brought together in a single body against their nature and constitution, more by passion than reason. All "*gens d'esprit*," and those well affected to the public good, are of our way of thinking, and above all, Her Highness and the Marquis. . . . This bad success is a great disappointment to me, quite contrary to our good intentions; but my conscience acquits me of having failed in all sincerity and industry to endeavour to bring everything to a good end, if God had not ordained otherwise. I pray God to employ us more successfully in future.'

By Christmas the prospects were no brighter; but in spite of drawbacks and of the unpromising aspect of the future, the Infanta was determined not to be diverted from her projected and much needed peace, and all through the winter, letters continued to pass, until, in 1628, Rubens was despatched upon his famous visit to Madrid.

Great as was the success of the diplomatist who won the favour of the Spanish minister and of the Spanish king, and ample as was the meed of praise awarded to him by his employers, the world remembers his visit to the capital of Spain, more by the pictures than by the protocols that came from his hand; and in viewing the rare works of his genius which (sixty-one in number) adorn that Royal Collection, we forget that he came to Castile for any other purpose than to paint Dian or Helen in the saloons of the Palace, or the Three Kings for the convent of the Carmelite Friars. Rubens spent eighteen months at Madrid, where he was made Gentleman of the Bedchamber to the King, and Honorary Secretary to the Privy Council. He returned to Brussels about Whitsuntide, and he was ordered to leave it shortly afterwards upon a still more auspicious mission to England and the English King, Charles.

Charles, whatever may have been his feelings towards the envoy of the Infanta and the advocate of her cherished plans, was ready, we know, to welcome Peter Paul Rubens the painter; but some ambiguity as to the exact nature of Rubens' errand seems to have prevailed in London. Thus, for example, did the inquisitive public and the officials gossip about the great man who had just landed from the Low Countries:—

'T. Meantys to Lady Bacon.

'You will peradventure hear speech of an ambassador arrived here from the Arch Duchesse, but it is only Rubens, the famous painter, appearing only in his own quality, and Gerbier, the Duke's painter, master of the ceremonies, to entertaine him.'

Also M. Barozzi to the Earl of Carlisle:—

'Your Excellency will hear thro' Mons. Rubens the reason of his coming to the Court.'

While Sir Dudley Carleton writes to Lord Dorchester:—

'Joachimi hath written hither that altho' Rubens be come, he hath brought with him no letters of credence, nor the least thing authentic and substantial; and yet there are great ones that maintain him in countenance, and will needs make something out of nothing.'

But they were all in the dark. Rubens had come, not to measure the ceiling of Whitehall, or to reproduce the features of Henrietta Maria and of her husband, under the names of Cleodolinde and of St. George, but to sound the intentions of Charles as to the proposed suspension of hostilities between the high contending Powers. Some such step had been anticipated and favoured by the Duke of Buckingham, in order, it was said, that he might prosecute with more effect his campaigns against France; but George Villiers was dead; the man who had ventured to browbeat the young Queen, and who had had a place in the heart of two kings, was no more; and, in Buckingham, Rubens had to all appearance lost an important patron. Lord Clarendon says of the Duke, that his friendships were so ardent that they were as so many marriages, for better and for worse, and his admiration for Rubens would soon, we feel, have ripened into such an attachment, had he been spared to meet at St. James's the former possessor of the magnificent collection which he had secured for his own halls. Sir Francis Cottington, the newly accredited ambassador to Spain, must have been, to judge by the similitude of his peaked visage, which is still to be seen among the other friends of the great Chancellor, in the collection at the Grove, a less pleasant personage to handle than had been his Grace of Buckingham. So great, however, was

the address of Peter Paul, that he made his way at Court without this or other recommendation than that of his genius; and he managed to secure an interview with Cottington before the departure of that minister to Madrid, a step which, from one cause or another, was delayed till after the fall of the leaf. Just as Sir Francis started on his mission, Don Carlos di Colonna arrived from Spain with full powers to complete the negotiation which Rubens had opened. The Don was admitted to an audience with the King before the Epiphany of the New Year. But to the suggestions of both these men (the painter and the plenipotentiary), Charles could only pay what attention he might have to spare from his own more pressing affairs. The loss of his own and of his father's friend obliged him to be his own Minister, and at this conjuncture he was also his own Parliament. The vexed question of tonnage and poundage was in dispute between himself and his Commons, and the Parliament had been, in consequence of their disagreement, dissolved many months previous to the day when he was invited to decide upon the foreign policy of the future. Being without money, and also without any legitimate means of procuring it, he was willing to entertain the idea of a Spanish treaty, and of a suspension of arms in the Netherlands: and the basis of a peace was agreed upon. Rubens, enchanted at this result of his efforts, was then at liberty to employ his pictorial talents, and to execute some of the commissions he had received in England; and thus he executed for Charles an allegorical piece which set forth the blessings of Peace and Plenty and the corresponding horrors of War—a composition which, if little in accordance with modern taste, is not the less as a painting a miracle of colouring, grouping, and execution.

It is curious that there is no fine portrait of the King from the hand of the visitor whom he so delighted to honour: it was reserved for his pupil Vandyke to hand down to posterity, with a grace more mellow and subdued than his master ever could command, the lineaments of that face, upon which misfortune seemed to have set her stamp from the day when it was cast in its mournful mould. Charles was the heir of a race by which the arts had ever been beloved, and of which one member only had been at once a pedant and a boor. The predilection seemed as hereditary in his family as its gift of beauty, its dowry of sadness, and its fate of violent deaths, outraged friends, and broken hearts; but the taste which had led James I. of Scotland to become a poet in captivity, and which had rendered Mary Stuart an over-indulgent listener to Châstelar's verses and David Rizzio's lute,

had, in her grandson, ripened into a positive passion ; and from the reign of Henry VII. to the domestic sway of the wise, accomplished, and good Prince whose loss we learn every day more deeply to deplore, Art has possessed in England no royal friend who can be compared with the ill-fated Charles. As regarded the Fleming, the ministers vied with the Monarch in distinguishing and flattering Rubens : he was the companion of the nobles in their festivals, and of the learned in their assemblies : one day he narrowly escaped drowning in a boating party on the Thames ; and another day he was conducted to Cambridge (where his name may be read among the graduates of 1629), and where, in presence of its Chancellor, Lord Holland, and in company with the French Ambassador, he received the honorary degree of Master of Arts of the University. The whole of his expenses while in London were defrayed by the King, who presented him with a diamond hat-band, and granted him an interview, during which the painter knelt, and after receiving a slight blow on the shoulder, rose as Sir Peter Paul Rubens, Knight. He now made several sketches for the decorations of Whitehall, and carried them with him on his return to Brussels and Antwerp, where the pictures were finished, about the latter end of the year 1634. For these it had been agreed that he was to receive 3000*l.* and a chain of gold ; but Charles's finances were then in a state of extreme embarrassment ; and it would appear that royal plate had to be melted down, and jewels pawned, ere the workman received his hire, which he ultimately did, after many and tedious delays. The vouchers for the five different instalments in which it was remitted, and the power of attorney given by Sir Peter Paul to one Lionel Wake, authorising him to receive these monies, are some of the curious papers relating to Rubens which Mr. Sainsbury has recovered and published.

The fortunate knight having received on his return the thanks of his employers, the congratulations of his friends, and the ovations of the public, obtained a patent from Philip IV., which confirmed the honours bestowed on him at St. James's, and he began to apply himself to the choice of a companion, who might share his honours, and restore to his house and studio the sunshine which seemed to have departed from them when the first shovelful of earth was thrown into Isabella Brandt's grave. Among the many fair dames, all anxious, nay, even ambitious, to enter upon the state and duties of Lady Rubens, Sir Peter Paul made a sufficiently startling choice : for the merchant Daniel Fourment's daughter Helena was only sixteen years of age, and she was, moreover, his niece by marriage ; that

is to say, she was the child of his first wife's sister, Clara Brandt. No one ever grudged to the diplomatist his success, or to the painter his undying renown, shall we grudge to Rubens this bright-eyed girlish bride—this Helena Fourmont, so young, so virtuous, and so beautiful, that we all seem to have loved and known her, with the pencilled brows and the lovely lashes that fringed but could not hide the liquid hazel of her eyes, with her rich hair, her taper fingers, and that tall column of her throat, which was set off by her spreading ruff? In this marriage, as in everything else, Rubens' good luck was unfailing, and their union is said to have been a happy one; Helena found him a kind and generous husband—she bore him sons and daughters—she escaped all scandal and calumny while he lived—and she wept for him sincerely when he died. Not long after her introduction to his fireside, she saw fresh honours heaped upon her lord: he was made Dean of the Painters' Guild, and once more desired by the Infanta to lay aside his brushes and his palette, and to serve her in a political mission, of which the object was a peace with the States of Holland. Rubens lost no time in obeying her behests. Alas! they were to be the last he was to receive from that kind and noble mistress, upon whose heart the word 'Peace' ought surely to have been found engraved; for though, in obedience to her commands, he journeyed to Brussels, Liège, Maestricht, and the Hague, he never succeeded in arranging more than the preliminaries of a treaty; and the project died with the Infanta Clara Eugenia Isabel in the end of the year 1633. This, the second occasion upon which Rubens had been employed to mediate between the Spanish Netherlands and those revolted provinces which now formed an independent republic, had two curious features which distinguish it from his other diplomatic errands: the first was the shuffle in the cards which, after the lapse of so many years, brought the son of John Rubens and the youngest son of William the Taciturn face to face: the one as a ruler, the other as the trusted envoy of a queen. The second peculiarity was the secrecy which, for some reason or reasons unknown, was observed both as to his journey and its object. Balthazar Gerbier was in a fever of curiosity in consequence: he travelled, he fidgetted from place to place, he sent provoking letters to the painter, and he wrote numberless conjectures to his employers in England: and a proof of the privacy with which even these remarks were made has been found by Mr. Sainsbury in the State Paper Office, where a scrap of a document is covered with the lines and dimensions of a frame, and with notes in Gerbier's handwriting; but this apparently insignificant paper has had written upon its

margin in some chemical fluid, so as to escape observation, 'The Great Painter, Rubens of Antwerp, has come here to 'treat with the Deputies of the States General:' 'a proof,' says Mr. Sainsbury, 'of the privacy with which that negotiation was carried on.'

In his house at Antwerp, being now full of years and of honour, Rubens received some royal visitors. There came in 1631 the Queen Mother of France, Mary of Medicis, not yet ready, it is true, to go away and die in the old house that we have seen in the Sternengasse of Cologne, but still something fallen from her state in the Luxembourg, for she is now in Antwerp on a poor errand: she must raise money on her jewels; and she pawned two to her former friend Sir Peter Paul. Later in the day, and after the Infanta is a little forgotten in the Netherlands, there comes Don Ferdinand, fresh from victory at Nordlingen, requiring triumphal arches and the like from the hand of the veteran artist, who made them all to admiration, though he painted them standing on one foot with the gout. He is too unwell at the last moment to see the entry of the Prince, so the Prince goes to visit the painter; and many more great men and wise were glad to be his guests; thus they went in and out, grandees and ambassadors, knights and ladies, artists, and friends: they talked and they feasted, just as you may see them doing in Holbein's 'Dance of Death;' and no one said, even if they thought of it, that another guest was due, who when he should come would bid the master of the house presently rise up, and go with him.

There was no doubt that the powers of that vigorous life were now somewhat impaired, for Rubens could no longer stand at his easel. Yet he was ready to undertake one or two great pictures, and the world is grateful to him for the effort. There was to be a portrait of Helena Fourment (now at Blenheim), where, radiant and stately, she looks, in the company of her son, something more matronly than when we saw her last. There must be the Cardinal Infant; that young victorious Don Ferdinand, with the battle of Nordlingen and the routed Swedes in the background; and above all, there was to be a picture for Cologne—that Crucifixion of St. Peter, which now enriches the Church of St. Peter, the place where John Rubens is buried. The history of this the last great work of the painter, whose childhood was spent in Cologne, and whose memory still reverted to the many-spired city on the Rhine, is the more curious from the details which Mr. Sainsbury gives of its origin. It was not intended by the artist or his employer for the place which it now occupies. In 1636, Rubens received from

G. Geldorp a commission for an altar-piece; and being surprised at receiving such an order from London, he wrote to Geldorp to say that he would undertake it if he got further instructions as to its subject and dimensions. Sir Peter Paul then learnt that the future owner of his canvass was to be M. Jabach of Cologne, a famous collector, who wished to present an altar-piece to the Church of the Holy Apostles. This information greatly pleased him, and he replied thus:—

‘Antwerp, July 15—25, 1637.

‘Sir,—Y^r honoured letter, of the last day of June, has come to hand. It dispels all my doubts, for I could not imagine why an altar-piece was wanted in London. As regards time: I must have a year and a half, in order to be able to serve your friend, without uneasiness or inconvenience. As regards the subject: it will suit me better to choose it according to the size of the picture, for there are subjects which are better treated in a large space, and others which require a medium, or smaller proportions. Nevertheless, if I might choose, or wish for a subject to my taste, relative to St. Peter, I would take his crucifixion, with his feet placed above. It appears to me that that would enable me to do something extraordinary—otherwise I leave the choice to him who will be at the expense of it, and until we have seen what the size of the picture will be.’

In 1638, he wrote again to say that the work was well advanced, that he was satisfied with its success, and that he hoped he should not be pressed to complete it. It was found in his atelier at the time of his death, finished but not sent home. M. Jabach then paid for it the sum of 1,200 florins (108*l.*), and he presented it not to the Church of the Apostles, but to the Church of St. Peter. The reason for this change of place does not appear. Perhaps the subject was thought to point to a place in a church dedicated to the saint whose martyrdom it commemorated; perhaps M. Jabach believed himself to be carrying out some wish, either understood or expressed, of Sir Peter Rubens; or if we take Smith's statement for granted, M. Jabach was then the owner of John Rubens' house in the Sternengasse, and we may find an explanation in the fact that that street is in the parish of St. Peter. There, at all events, the art-loving citizen caused it to be placed, and there it remains; all who behold it pronouncing it to be, what the painter promised that it should be, ‘a something extraordinary.’

As late as 1640, Balthazar Gerbier had dealings with Rubens about some designs for the cabinet of Queen Henrietta Maria at Greenwich; but one of his letters to England brought heavy tidings in its postscript—‘Sir Peter Rubens is deadly sick; the physicians of this town (Brussels) being sent unto him for ‘to try their best skill on him.’ This was indeed the case: the

patient had ague and gout, and, finally, what the physicians called 'a deflaction' on the heart; and being past all help, the next news soon came, that Sir Peter Paul Rubens had departed this life, at Antwerp, on the 20th day of May: aged sixty-two years, ten months, and twenty-one days.

The day of his death and the day of his funeral were sad days in the city. The clergy formed a long procession to the Church of St. James's, where he was to be laid, and by the bier stood sixty orphan boys: for the poor of Antwerp had lost in him a liberal and a thoughtful friend. For him no neighbourhood of grove and field had to be selected; but among the pillars of a solemn, yet gorgeous church, with coloured lights from stained windows, with wreaths of incense smoke, and pealing notes of the organ and sweet boy voices of the choir, they left him—busy head, loving heart, and crafty hand all at rest for ever. His widow took another mate; his children ripened into men and maids; his pupils went out into the world to reap laurels of their own: but his pictures we have always with us, and his influence on art is one that cannot pass away.

Here in England, where he was a happy and an honoured guest, where we possess so many and so remarkable examples of his genius, is it not strange that he should not have found a biographer and an historian? In the country which boasts of his 'Chapeau de Paille,' his 'Wolf Hunt,' and so many of his family pieces, and which can show at Blenheim, a collection of his works only surpassed in number and in value by four royal galleries of Europe, it is astonishing that Rubens, his life, his times, his embassies, his scholars, and his school, have not received a notice more than fragmentary. His engravers alone would furnish a curious chapter: it might be shown why he selected such men as Lucas Vosterman (or Vorsterman), Witdonk, Bolswert, and Paul Pontius to interpret and perpetuate copies of his pictures—and told where Bolswert learnt the vigour of his style, where Pontius acquired the sweetness of his line.*

* As there are not less than 1,200 engravings after Rubens' works, much information is to be gained from the illustrations which have come from the burins of Lommelin, Collaert, C. and Th. Galle, Duparc, Baillu, Boel, Smith, Van Uden, George Cooke, Van Kessel, Brown, Eyndhoudt, Van Thulden, Nees, Tronvain, Murtinasi, Duchange, Chastillon, Prenner, Lorenzini, N. Varin, Van-Sompel, Stock, Mogalli, Visscher, Voet, de Viel, Hodges, Mechel, Blömart, Lasne, Soutman, Pilsens, N. Ryckman, and Van der Leeuw; not to speak of the beautiful series from the Luxemburg gallery, engraved by Nattier and de Séve: or of the etchings executed by Spruyt, Paneels, and Street.

Rubens etched occasionally himself: neither was the illustration of books and missals neglected by him, for a life of Ignatius Loyola has no less than seventy-eight of his designs; while eleven are to be seen in a missal printed by Moretus, besides fifty headings for pages, and a great number of vignettes in different places. He published at one time a pamphlet on the imitation of Greek statues, and seems to have bestowed no little thought upon the study of the antique, for an original fragment upon this subject is bound up in De Pile's '*Cours de Peinture par Principes*;' and there is the beautiful letter to Francis Junius, of which the original is among the Harleian MSS. in the British Museum, which has been admirably rendered by Mr. Sainsbury in the volume before us. Another publication of Rubens' he called '*Un livre à dessiner*,' and to this he added a second part; but they are not much remembered; and his principal literary labour is the '*Palazzi Antichi e Moderni di Genova; raccolti e disegnati da Pietro Paulo Rubens: Anversa: A.D. 1613*,' in the compilation of which he was assisted by his brother Philip.

Mr. Sainsbury has given us the epitaph of the painter from the pen of Dr. Gevaerts, and in the appendix has added a translation of one composed during his lifetime by Doctor Dominic Bandius. Is Mr. Sainsbury acquainted with another? A quaint compliment turned upon the name of the painter:—

‘PET. PAUL RUBENS.

‘*Ipsa suos Iris, dedit ipsa Aurora colores,
Nox umbras, Titan lumina clara tibi:
Das tu Rubenius vitam, mentemque figuris,
Et per te vivit lumen, et umbra, color—
Quid te Rubeni nigro mors funere volvit?
Vivis, vita tuo picta colore rubet.—
Obiit A.D. 1640: Ætat. 63.*

This concentrated essence of praise, which seems to us little better than a pun, was such a ‘conceit’ as was affected by the taste of a past age: but we should welcome in this country a literary monument to the memory of Rubens worthy of the great genius and versatile talents of the artist-ambassador; and if in these pages we have trespassed too long on the patience of the reader, it is because that has been found to be true, which Fuseli said to the students of the Royal Academy when addressing them upon the subject of the painter of Antwerp, ‘Gentlemen, of Rubens it would be easier to say nothing at all than to say only a little.’

- ART. V.—1. *Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire.* Par M. A. THIERS. Tome vingtième. Paris: 1862.
2. *Histoire de la Campagne de 1815.* Par EDGAR QUINET. Paris: 1862.
3. *Histoire de la Campagne de 1815.* Par le Lieutenant-Colonel CHARRAS. Brussels: 1858.
4. *Waterloo: the Downfall of the First Napoleon.* By GEORGE HOOPER. London: 1862.

THESE four authors have published, within a short period of time, four narratives of the campaign of Waterloo, each distinct from the others in its bias, and each inconsistent with the others in its statements of fact. M. Thiers has composed a brilliant medley of truth and fiction. It closes his history of the Empire, and is chiefly marked by a resolution to defend the strategy of Napoleon, whether at the cost of his generals or of his opponents. M. Quinet, who is more discerning on the French side, is nearly as inaccurate on the English; but his predilections, though equally vehement, are national and not personal. Colonel Charras, on the other hand, is less unfair to either nation, though his narrative is disfigured by a violent antipathy to the Bonapartes. The first would disparage both the French and the English for the sake of his hero; the second would sacrifice both the English and Napoleon to the credit of France; and the third would assign the defeat of his countrymen wholly to the blunders of their chief. From our own point of view Mr. Hooper deserves the credit of being at once more accurate and more impartial. These conflicting expositions have invested an old subject with a new interest. There is, indeed, a fifth production on the battle of Waterloo, by M. Victor Hugo. But we shall take no other notice of it than to point out that it is compounded of rhapsody and buffoonery, which can claim no place in historical discussion.

It may seem strange that the literature of three nations should be still fighting for the glory of Waterloo. The French writers grow only the more angry as the long period of un-avenging peace extends. The Prussian writers, such as Clausewitz, appear more jealous of having missed victory than the French are of having encountered defeat. And in England the spark of controversy is kept alive in replying to the fire of both enemy and ally. Waterloo is certainly the only battle touching the details of which the world is still curious. No one now cares to know the details of the tactics by which

Napoleon won at Austerlitz, or lost at Leipsic. Magenta and Solferino have come and gone; yet no volumes appear to prove by what combinations those battles were really won.

This distinction arises, not from a mere fashion, but from that just and instinctive appreciation which is often the solid foundation of a fashion. Waterloo was the last act in a military drama of a splendour and of a duration almost without parallel. Lapse of time, which has been rendering the political results of other battles obsolete, has meanwhile increased the importance of that great conflict. The campaign marked also a new period in military tactics; for it was incomparably the most rapid that had been fought. Wellington and Blücher condensed the weeks of Bonapartist campaigns into days, as Napoleon had condensed the months of Marlborough and Frédéric into weeks, and as Marlborough and Frédéric had condensed the years of Wallenstein and Gustavus into months. It brought together for the first and last time the two greatest captains of that age, and captains equal to those of any age. There had not been a decisive collision of equal military reputations in Europe since the battle of Pharsalia. There had not been the existence of an empire at stake on a single field, where such reputations were involved, since the battle of Zama. Frédéric, Eugene, Marlborough, Vendôme, Charles of Sweden and Charles of Germany, Napoleon himself in his former wars, never encountered their own equals, nor won campaigns so rapid and eventful. Waterloo thus preserves its preeminence, at once in its political results, in its tactics, and in the reputation of those who fought it. It will probably never be surpassed in any one of these three characteristics.

But we are greatly surprised that no progress should be made towards a general acknowledgment of the facts of so short a campaign, though we are hardly surprised that the controversy itself is kept alive. Forty years of literary disputation leave contemporary historians in wider dissension, touching the events of four days, of which many of the actors still remain, than they were when this critical inquiry began. Meanwhile there has been much to elucidate, as well as much in this very controversy to obscure, the truth. The genuine and authentic correspondence of the generals in command, during the campaign itself, has been brought to light. And in spite of the gloss which Napoleon threw upon this history from St. Helena, and of the extreme statements of both his blindfold admirers and his blindfold detractors, it has been easy to trace the strategy of either general by his despatches. Yet even now, M. Quinet writes in ignorance of many of the records that exist for the history which he

affects to write. M. Thiers is so rancorous, and self-contradictory into the bargain, as plainly to show that he has not even a desire to arrive at the truth. This final volume of his work falls like a sentence of death on his historical credit. It contains more errors, exhibits more bias, breathes more hatred, than all his previous nineteen volumes combined. In point of credibility, it is one continual romance: in point of intention, it is the 'avenging of Waterloo.' Historians venture in where sovereigns fear to tread.

There is nothing, indeed, to render such a class of literature inadmissible, if it once abandon its pretensions to the rigour and the dignity of history. It may then assume the grateful form of national legend, in which every disaster wears a smile, and every triumph is clothed with a still more dazzling lustre. There may then be some sort of comparison between it and that style of composition which Burke described as midway between prose and poetry, and as surpassing either. Like Carlovingian romance, it may live as a fiction intertwined with facts of which alone the writers might be proud: but with the distinction, indeed, that the Paladins of Napoleon here create his disasters. But this is not the character for which M. Thiers himself contends. In the fine imagery of a previous volume, he compares the medium of the historian between actual events and the public to whom he relates them, to that transparent glass whose intervention the eye, in looking beyond it, does not suspect. He could hardly employ such a metaphor without appreciating what history ought to be: but in point of fact he has covered with his own figures, and darkened with his own colours, the glass he should have left transparent. The creatures of his own magic-lantern bound our view: we see nothing beyond them.

If this were the characteristic of the whole work of M. Thiers, or if the romantic essence of his twentieth volume were avowed, literal criticism would give place to a panegyric on the art which has designed so ingenious and beautiful a solace for the misfortune of the French army. But M. Thiers holds a middle ground between avowed romance writers and acknowledged historians. In dealing with the domestic and administrative history of his own country, we believe that he has written with an almost rigorous fidelity. Such historical pretensions in matters with which his own countrymen must be best acquainted, readily win their acquiescence in a military fiction that conciliates their susceptibility. If, therefore, we write for them as well as for ourselves, we must look at this work as it stands in their estimation.

M. Thiers, then, begins by very imperfectly dealing with this

campaign, when he describes its arrangements as turning wholly on questions of strategy. He baldly states the dispositions of the armies on either side of the frontier, and shuts every political consideration out of view. But both Napoleon and the allied generals were chiefly governed by circumstances external to the campaign itself. If Napoleon had not found himself compelled to anticipate the irruption of the Austrians and Russians on the Upper Rhine, his attack on Wellington and Blücher would probably have been judged rash, as well as desperate. And if Wellington and Blücher had not wider interests to defend than the route by which Napoleon advanced, the dispersion of their forces would have been marked with the imbecility which M. Thiers ascribes to it.

The objects of the allied commanders, which M. Thiers overlooks, have been clearly stated by the Duke of Wellington himself in his answer to General Clausewitz. They were three in number. It was necessary, in the first place, to maintain communications between England, Holland, and Germany. For this purpose there was no choice but to occupy in force the Belgian provinces, from the coast of the German Ocean to the frontiers of Rhenish Prussia, or even to the Rhine. In the second place, it was held necessary to preserve the territorial demarcations established by the Congress of Vienna, and therefore to maintain the integrity of the kingdom of the Netherlands, which the Congress had just created. And thirdly, the allied armies, while they remained on the defensive within the Belgian frontier, were required to bar equally the various roads by which Napoleon might have advanced against them.

It was, on the other hand, the aim of Napoleon to put these two allied armies *hors de combat* before the month of July; for by that time he would have been able to accept a conflict with the other forces of the Allies on the Upper Rhine. The initiative, therefore, lay with the French. It would have been imprudent for the Allies to invade France in June with less than half the force with which they might invade in July, France being defended by uncertain numbers, and the French fortresses on the northern frontier being too strong to be soon reduced. As the Allies, therefore, would not attack Napoleon, Napoleon was forced to attack them. We are informed by a distinguished general officer, who was in the habit of dining with the Duke of Wellington at Brussels before the campaign began, that the Duke frequently said at dinner, 'The best thing Bonaparte can do is to come and attack me. He may drive me back to Antwerp, perhaps; and if he does, that will put off the business [his dethronement] for two months.' The Duke and

Napoleon here agreed; but they differed as to the route by which the French should have advanced.

M. Thiers takes much natural pleasure in describing the English general as the dupe of every feint of his opponent. He says (p. 18.) that—

‘Napoleon conceived an ingenious method of deceiving the Duke of Wellington, to whom he ascribed much more penetration than to Marshal Blücher. He had clearly perceived that the British general, coming as he did from the sea, and resting upon it, would take infinite care to prevent himself from being cut off from this basis of action. He therefore ordered the mobilised national guards to march out of Lille, Dunkirk, and the neighbouring places, and to drive back the hostile outposts with a military demonstration, which would threaten serious operations.’

The object, then, of this manœuvre was to threaten Ghent and Antwerp from Lille; while, in point of fact, Napoleon was concentrating his army between Maubeuge and Charleroi. The manœuvre itself is fairly described, and M. Thiers immediately exults over the ‘succès du stratagème de Napoléon.’ But where is the proof of the success? M. Thiers, of course, points in triumph to the dispersion of the Duke’s army in the direction in which this feint was made. Its result was, according to him, that ‘Napoleon had all his corps before him, at a distance of ‘five or six leagues from one another, masked by a thick forest, ‘and without the enemy knowing anything of it—to judge, at ‘least by his immovability.’

That the Duke was not ‘surprised’ by an attack being made on his positions, about the time that Napoleon invaded Belgium, may be assumed without argument. He thought such an attack to be the Emperor’s best course; and the previous feints of the French, whether taken to be such or not, at least foreshadowed it. But this consideration leaves it still a question whether he experienced a surprise, in the technical sense of the term, by the attack being made when and where it was.

Napoleon possessed for his first advance a great superiority over his enemy, in respect of everything but numbers. He could both concentrate his army in secret and choose his own points of attack. His line of fortresses on the Belgian frontier sufficed to mask his operations until the last moment. M. Thiers, to a certain extent, acknowledges this to be the case. But he entirely suppresses the fact that there were five main roads between the Meuse and the Lys, by any one of which Napoleon might have advanced. One was the route of Charleroi, which was the route chosen. One ran from Maubeuge upon Mons, Hal, and Brussels. One from Va-

lenciennes and Condé upon Mons. One from Condé upon Ath, Enghien, and Brussels. One from Lille upon Tournay and Ath. And, indeed, there was a sixth, though further to the west, from Lille upon Menin, Courtrai, and Ghent. Most of these were wide and paved roads. The advance upon each was protected and concealed by fortresses on the French side of the frontier; but on the Belgian side there were no other fortifications than the field-works which the Duke had hastily thrown up.

Prince Blücher's army, meanwhile, was occupied chiefly with the defence of the line of Charleroi, and was stationed along the valleys of the Meuse and Sambre. The defence of all the other lines, therefore, fell to the army of the Duke of Wellington. M. Thiers, then, having admitted that the French fortresses concealed the movements of Napoleon, must also admit the necessity of guarding each of these routes by some such cantonments of the Duke's army as were actually made. Wellington had no such means of concealing from the French his own movements on the frontier, as the French on their side enjoyed against him. If, therefore, he had concentrated his army upon one of these roads, before the invasion began, Napoleon would certainly have turned him in flank by another. If he had failed to protect each by a distinct cantonment, the enemy would have advanced with double rapidity, and before he had had time to concentrate. Thus, in the attack which actually happened, the Prussian division under Ziethen, which held the route of Charleroi, kept the French in check until two-thirds of Blücher's army were concentrated at Ligny. The allied commanders, therefore, were prepared for an attack by Napoleon, whenever and wherever it might be made. Of the time and place at which it would be made, they could know nothing, except by the uncertain aid of spies and intrigues.

To this certain unimportant reservations may be made. It is true that the dispersion of the Duke's army was also dictated by the difficulty of finding pasturage for the cavalry, except in the district in which he quartered them. It is likewise true that Fouché had promised the Duke a plan of the Emperor's campaign, and that either Napoleon or Fouché himself arrested the bearer on the frontier. But we cannot imagine the Duke depending upon a communication obviously liable to mischances, and of doubtful authenticity at last. And, again, it is true that the Duke held an attack on his right more probable than upon his left. He thought it more probable because he thought it more likely to be successful. The event at least showed that it could hardly have been less so.

M. Thiers, at this point, offers two leading criticisms against

the Duke of Wellington's defensive tactics. He first charges the Duke with not penetrating the design of Napoleon to intercept his communications with the Prussians, through an undue reliance on an attack being made upon his right; and he secondly condemns the dispersion of his troops over an area which would prevent their concentration 'within two or three days.' Let us glance at these positions in order.

Touching the former criticism, M. Thiers observes:—

'Mais en attendant on n'avait pris que de médiocres précautions pour se garantir contre une brusque apparition des Français. Le Duc de Wellington, dont la perspicacité était ici en défaut, n'avait songé qu'à se préserver d'une attaque le long de la mer, ce qui pourtant n'était guère à craindre. . . . De ce dernier danger [namely, the attack by Charleroi], de beaucoup le plus réel, le Duc de Wellington et Blücher n'avaient rien entrevu.' (P. 26.)

No doubt, if Napoleon's strategy had succeeded, it would have been regarded as the most brilliant manœuvre of his life. By seizing Charleroi, and marching on Quatre Bras and Fleurus, he hoped to separate his enemies, beat them in detail, and, in fact, to destroy them by a *coup de main*. On the other hand, by invading from Condé or Maubenge, he would probably have thrown one army on the other. No English tactician attempts to dispute the skill with which Napoleon concealed and concentrated his army behind the Sambre, or the boldness with which he conducted their advance, during the 15th, towards the cantonments of the Allies. This plan was much more consonant with Napoleon's tactics than an attack upon Wellington's right. But the result showed that his scheme was nevertheless impracticable: he did not, and therefore presumptively could not, beat his enemies in detail, for they were finally combined to resist him. The Duke held not only that Napoleon had more chance of success by advancing against his right in the first instance, but even after Ligny and Quatre Bras were fought, by attempting to turn his position at Hal instead of seeking to force it at Waterloo. Nor does Napoleon himself dispute this conclusion. His plan of attack, however brilliant, was desperate, because his power of separating the allied armies was a contingency, and their power of destroying him, if he failed to separate them, was a certainty.

Secondly, in regard to the undue dispersion of the army. After describing their cantonments, M. Thiers says:—

'The Duke of Wellington had hoped by this distribution to place himself in a position to concentrate, either on his right in the event of an attack by the sea, or on his left in case of its being necessary for him to march to the support of the Prussians.'

It will be seen that by this admission M. Thiers contradicts his previous assertion that the allied generals had not provided against the event of an attack by the Sambre. He goes on, however, to say:—

‘But even in this double intention his corps were too much dispersed: *for two or three days, at the least*, were required to reunite them on their right or on their left.’ (P. 27.)

Even if this statement were accurate, it would be scarcely apposite. The alternatives were now transferred to the side of the Allies. As the choice of a line of attack originally lay with Napoleon, so the choice of a line of defence now fell to Wellington and Blücher. They might have first met the French either on the line of Ligny and Quatre Bras, which was the line they chose, or on the line of Wavre and Waterloo, or, thirdly, in the rear of the forest of Soignies, where the roads from Wavre and Waterloo converged, and immediately in advance of Brussels. Thus the Allies might have fallen back almost indefinitely until their concentration was complete.

But as a matter of fact, the Duke of Wellington was in position at Quatre Bras, upon the most advanced of these three available lines of defence, within twenty-four hours after the first intelligence of the invasion had reached him, and with at least force enough to hold in check the force there brought against him. The Duke, however, has himself answered a similar criticism, when put forward by General Clausewitz. He then said that although the objects of protection by his army were extended over a greater area than those protected by the Prussians—and although the country was there traversed in its whole extent by paved roads leading from French fortresses, and therefore required a different system of occupation—his orders nevertheless reached the furthest cantonment of his army within six hours after he had issued them. Far from ‘two or three days’ being required for its concentration, the definitive order for this purpose was not issued until the night of the 15th, and during the night of the 16th the Duke had nearly 70,000 men at Quatre Bras.

The two main questions which arise here are, first, whether Napoleon intended to seize the positions of Quatre Bras and Sombrefe on the 15th; and, secondly, whether Wellington and Blücher were justified in defending that line. Without discussing the former question at length, we think it clear that Napoleon did not. He bivouacked his main army to the south of the wood of Fleurus on that night, in order to conceal its position and number from Ziethen’s reconnoitring parties until the next day. This implies a preconcerted design to postpone the

advance on Sombreffe. Such a resolution being taken for his right, it must have been taken also for his left; for otherwise the parallel of the two wings would have been lost, and the latter have exposed itself to the chance of being surrounded. The latter question must be answered in detail.

Had it not been for extraordinary negligence, the English army would have combined at Quatre Bras at least twelve hours earlier. The Duke did not receive intelligence at Brussels of the first attack upon the Prussian outposts at Thuin, which took place at four o'clock in the morning, until three in the afternoon. Nor did he hear of the fall of Charleroi, which had taken place at eleven in the morning, until midnight. In other words, the latter information had occupied thirteen hours in traversing less than forty miles. Several explanations have been made of this delay. We believe the true one to be, as regards the fall of Charleroi, that General Ziethen, in command of the Prussian division there, despatched but one aide-de-camp to Brussels; and that this aide-de-camp, in consequence of the rapid advance of a portion of the French cavalry, found one of the villages on his way already in their possession. But even the earlier despatch, announcing the fall of Thuin at four, was sent by the circuit of Charleroi, which it did not leave until nine. The Prussian officer in command at Thuin ought of course to have despatched it by the direct route of Binche and Nivelles where the attack first took place.

If we suppose the Duke's information to have been accelerated as it ought to have been, he would have been in position in time to have executed the flank movement from Quatre Bras to Ligny, which would have united the bulk of the English and Prussian armies, before the attack of either by the French on the 16th. But even in failure of this combination, it was open to the allied commanders, almost to the last moment, to fall back at once on an interior line, had they deemed themselves in insufficient strength to check the enemy separately on the line of Sombreffe and Quatre Bras.

These considerations appear to vindicate the defensive arrangements of the Duke and Prince Blücher down to the opening of the two battles of Ligny and Quatre Bras. Since many stories have been related of the Duke's presence at the Duchess of Richmond's ball, and many inferences founded upon them, we may here state what we believe the truth to be. The Duke had issued his first orders on the arrival of the Prince of Orange, and on the confirmation of the Prince's intelligence by General Muffling, the Prussian staff-officer at the Duke's headquarters, soon after three in the afternoon. He afterwards issued

his final orders at ten in the evening. Having done this, he went to the ball. The Prince of Orange, who had been there also, left early in the evening, before supper, for his quarters at Braine le Comte. The Duke of Wellington remained; and during supper, at about midnight, the Prince, who had retired some two hours before, suddenly reappeared, walked up to the Duke's chair, and said a few words in a tone so low that they did not catch the ear of those around him; but the Duke coolly replied that he had no further orders to give, and said to the Prince, 'I should think the best thing you can do is to go to bed.' The Prince then left, and the Duke remained talking to the lady on his right for some twenty minutes afterwards. He then rose, went up to the Duke of Richmond ostensibly to say good night, but added in a lower tone, 'Do you happen to have a map of the country?' The Duke of Richmond left the supper-table, apparently to attend the Commander-in-Chief to the door, and in his private room the map was produced. As soon as the door of this room was shut, the Duke of Wellington said, 'Bonaparte has gained near twenty-four hours' march upon me.' 'What shall you do?' asked the Duke of Richmond. 'We shall meet him at Quatre Bras, but we shan't stop him there; and if we don't, I'll fight him *here*,' said the Duke of Wellington, drawing his thumb-nail across the plain of Waterloo on the map. The Duke of Richmond immediately afterwards mentioned this conversation to our informant, whom he had left in the supper-room, and showed him the map with the mark drawn by Wellington across the plain of Waterloo.

This anecdote, which we have from one of the most distinguished survivors of Waterloo, and who occupied the next seat but one to the Duke of Wellington during supper, serves to explain much that has perplexed several writers on this campaign. The intelligence brought by the Prince of Orange at midnight, and which confounded its astonished bearer, was the capture of Charleroi at eleven o'clock that morning, and the advance of the French towards Gosselies and Fleurus. The Duke, there can be no doubt, was extremely ill-served either by the aides-de-camp of General Ziethen, or by the General himself. We have seen that eleven hours had elapsed before he learnt the capture of Thuin, and thirteen before he learnt the fall of Charleroi, which had taken place only seven hours after that of Thuin. It is rendered certain by the Duke's letter of the 15th to the Duc de Feltre, that he had not learnt of the fall of Charleroi when he went to the ball. This letter is dated 10 o'clock P.M., and after mentioning the capture of Thuin, runs, 'Je n'ai rien reçu depuis neuf heures du matin de Charleroi.'

Eleven hours after the taking of a fortified place, not forty miles distant, the Duke knew nothing of it. He may possibly be criticised for not having secured better informants; but we see no antecedent reason to have led him to distrust the zeal of General Ziethen, whose duty it of course was, in so important a matter, to despatch several aides-de-camp to the English head-quarters, each by a different route.

This misadventure is transformed by M. Edgar Quinet into a complaint that 'the Duke of Wellington, not knowing where to expect the enemy, lost thirteen hours in temporising or in 'frivolous displays' (p. 107.). He charitably ascribes it to the fact of the Duke 'never having commanded against Napoleon, and of his not understanding the character of his adversary.' Had the Duke's frank and unguarded expression to the Duke of Richmond been known to M. Quinet, no doubt he would have made a good deal of it. But his statement is not only without proof; it is plainly untrue. We have seen that the Duke's intelligence of the driving in of the Prussian outposts at Thuin reached Brussels at 3 P.M.; and that it did not leave Charleroi till 9 A.M., five hours after Thuin had been taken. It was then demonstrated that Charleroi was within six hours of Brussels, and there is no doubt the distance might have been traversed in much less time. The Duke, therefore, had a right to expect that Charleroi would not have fallen for six hours without his knowing it; and when he went to the ball at eleven, he was justified in presuming that Charleroi had not fallen up to 5 P.M. at the earliest; though in fact it had fallen at eleven in the morning.

Now until the Duke had more precise intelligence than this preliminary attack upon Thuin, and advance towards Charleroi, it was hard to say whether this was a feint, or the enemy's principal movement. Thuin is a village on the Sambre nearly equidistant from Charleroi and the bridge at Sobre commanding the road to Mons. From that point, therefore, either line of advance might have been chosen. The Duke was convinced that Napoleon had nothing to gain by throwing himself between two fires, and he awaited certain news of the mass of the enemy having taken the route of Charleroi, before he completely uncovered the route of Mons, by which, had he uncovered it, a French army might at once have turned his right flank. His orders, therefore, issued soon after 3 P.M. on the 15th, were for part of his army to march towards Quatre Bras, and for the rest to be ready at a moment's notice. He thus accepted the hypothesis of a general attack by Charleroi without committing himself irrevocably to it; nor could he anticipate

loss of time by this reserve; for he was hourly expecting fresh intelligence, on which definitive orders could be transmitted by the time that each division, acting on the former order, was ready to march. When at half-past nine in the evening he learnt from General Dornberg, that the enemy had not appeared by the route of Mons, he accepted this hypothesis absolutely; and issued the orders dated 10 P.M. for the immediate concentration of the mass of his army at Quatre Bras, though still ignorant that Charleroi had fallen.

The Duke of Wellington has himself defended this circumspection on his own part in a few plain and memorable words:—

‘It must never be lost sight of,’ he writes, ‘that to found upon an hypothesis which might and probably would prove erroneous, considering what were the advantages of the position of the enemy on the frontier, the alteration of the defensive position of the allied armies might have occasioned what is commonly called a false movement; and it must be observed that, whatever may be thought of Bonaparte as a leader of troops in other respects, there certainly never existed a man in that situation, in any times, in whose presence it was so little safe to make what is called a false movement.’

So much for the defensive arrangements of the allied commanders, on which the chief criticism against them obviously turns. One word on the composition of their armies.

It is strange that after this subject has been in dispute for more than forty years, neither M. Thiers nor M. Quinet know anything of the composition of the Duke's army. Here are two instances of the most ludicrous ignorance that can be met with even in the pages of French writers of English history.

● Take first M. Thiers:—

‘The Duke of Wellington,’ says the historian of the Consulate and the Empire, ‘had the disposal of a hundred thousand men — English, Hanoverians, Dutch, Belgians, Brunswickers, and subjects of Nassau. *The English were old soldiers, tried by twenty years of war, and justly elated by their successes in Spain.*’ (P. 25.)

So M. Quinet, in a characteristic passage, which would suffer by translation:—

‘*La moitié au moins de cette armée était de vieilles troupes éprouvées dans la guerre d'Espagne; et pour celles-là une discipline implacable, telle que l'aristocratie sait l'imposer: nul espoir, nulle possibilité d'avancement pour les sous-officiers, retenus, quoiqu'ils fassent, à jamais dans les mêmes grades inférieurs.*’ (P. 65.)

The allied army which fought at Waterloo was incontestably the worst that was ever brought together under an English commander. The bulk of the Duke's Peninsular army, which

MM. Thiers and Quinet imagine to have fought in the Netherlands, had been despatched to North America, and had not then returned to Europe. Instead of M. Quinet's 50,000 old Peninsular campaigners, almost the only troops that had seen a shot fired in battle were the English guards and certain battalions of the Hanoverian Legion, which formed part of the English army. The motley army under command of the Duke was composed, in round numbers, of 35,000 English, 6,000 King's German Legion, 25,000 Hanoverians, 7,500 Brunswickers, and nearly 30,000 Dutch and Belgians. The English part of this army consisted chiefly of recent recruits, second battalions, or militiamen. The whole of the Hanoverian army was a militia force. The Dutch and Belgians neither possessed the common courage of men nor were their hearts in the cause of the Allies. Not only were their squares repeatedly broken; they sometimes anticipated the charge of the enemy by running away before the collision took place; and British officers assert that, on their march to Quatre Bras on the morning of the 16th. they met these Dutch and Belgians in numerous parties of thirty and fifty, leisurely marching back from the field of battle with their muskets over their shoulders, and declaring (though the enemy was never in greater number than the Allies) that 'the French were fifty to one, and they were not going to stop there to be massacred.'

The French army, on the other hand, consisted chiefly of veterans, many of whom had been set free on the first Restoration as prisoners of war taken in former campaigns. It was also homogeneous, and corresponded to what MM. Thiers and Quinet affect to describe the English part of the army under command of the Duke of Wellington. The Prussian army was nearly equal to the French both in numbers and condition. There were probably 117,000 Prussians and 126,000 French. But of the 105,000 under the command of the Duke, not more than some 90,000 could be spared from garrison duty, which did not devolve upon the Prussians. In numbers, discipline, and national organisation, this army was vastly inferior both to the French and the Prussian. The Duke, therefore, was more dependent on Blücher than Blücher on the Duke.

Let us glance now at the movements of Napoleon on the 15th and the morning of the 16th. M. Thiers writes an account of them which is as full of error as his description of the defensive arrangements of the Allies. The reason is clear. He deliberately abandons his critical reputation in order to uphold the apocryphal Memoirs written at St. Helena. This

may be a generous self-denial; but unfortunately the vindication is too transparent either to establish the credibility of Napoleon, or to avoid the sacrifice of his own.

The leading columns of the French army appear to have crossed the Sambre, by the contiguous bridges of Marchiennes and Charleroi, before noon on the 15th. Thence they advanced in two directions, the one leading to Gosselies, Frasnè, and Quatre Bras, the other to Fleurus, Ligny, and Sombreffe.* Charleroi is the apex of a triangle of which the chaussée from Nivelles to Namur forms the base. Its other angles are at Quatre Bras and Sombreffe, where each of the two roads from Charleroi respectively falls upon the chaussée that forms the base of this triangle. By seizing, therefore, both Quatre Bras and Sombreffe, Napoleon would command the highway from Nivelles to Namur, and thus intercept the communications of the English from the west, and the Prussians from the east along that parallel. It will be seen that this was his original design on the 15th; but that he did not expect, until the afternoon on the 16th, to risk a battle for either position.

The movements of Napoleon during the first day of the invasion have commonly been considered faultless. But as they became of doubtful success on the 16th, and totally failed on the 18th, M. Thiers throws the blame of each miscarriage on one or other of the marshals, just as Napoleon had done already. M. Quinet, on the contrary, and Colonel Charras appear to write on these questions with strict accuracy.

M. Thiers, then, describes Marshal Ney as responsible for the doubtful result of the two battles of the 16th. He alleges that the Marshal did not execute his orders when he received them. These orders, he says, were to occupy Quatre Bras on the 15th, which the Marshal did not attempt to do until three o'clock in the afternoon of the 16th. When, then, was this order given? M. Thiers states that it was first given by word of mouth in the afternoon of the 15th. In support of this position, he cites a conversation between the Marshal and Napoleon (p. 40.), for which he adduces no authority. He here describes Ney as ordered to occupy Quatre Bras. Colonel Heymès, however, who was with the Marshal at the time, declares — as M. Quinet observes (p. 93.) — that the only instructions of Napoleon were, '*Allez et poussez l'ennemi.*' That Quatre Bras was not occupied on the night of the 15th, M. Thiers ascribes to the apprehension of Ney, on hearing the

* The reserve, under Girard, 25,000 strong, did not cross the Sambre at Châtelet until the morning of the 16th.

cannon of Vandamme upon his right, that the Prussians would be in his rear. The writer then takes great merit to Napoleon for not resenting, during the night of the 15th, a disobedience to orders which, as will be seen, had never been issued. At midnight Ney returned to Charleroi to sup with Napoleon; and at seven in the morning of the 16th he met General Reille, to whom, as M. Quinet writes (p. 96.), he stated that he was then awaiting his orders. Later in the morning, he received the official orders of the Major-general, Soult, and a letter from the Emperor, which was conveyed by Count Flahault, a distinguished general officer, to whom M. Thiers pays a tribute that is no more than due. So little familiar was Quatre Bras to Soult and Napoleon then, that it is termed by the one *Trois Bras*, and by the other *Quatre Chemins*. Nor does either make any reference to previous instructions for the occupation of this place. It is acknowledged by M. Thiers that M. de Flahault did not leave Charleroi until nine, nor arrive at Ney's quarters at Frasne until ten. The letter he bore alluded to the Major-general's order as an instruction yet to come. That probably did not reach him till eleven or twelve. Even on these data it is impossible to charge Ney with an appreciable loss of time. Yet M. Thiers says that the Marshal hesitated in front of Quatre Bras during the whole morning, when first opposed by only 4,000 men under Prince Bernhard of Saxe-Weimar, and that about three in the afternoon he first summoned resolution to fight!

But the fact is that even these orders did not anticipate a contest at Quatre Bras. They afford a remarkable proof that Napoleon, from the outset, entirely miscalculated the Duke of Wellington's tactics. He here instructs Ney to seize Quatre Bras, to push on his cavalry to Genappe, and even to threaten Nivelles on his left; alleging that the enemy had probably withdrawn by the routes of Nivelles and Brussels. So confident was the Emperor of meeting with no serious obstacle on that side, that he further instructs Ney to be ready to march on Brussels. He declares that he will himself attack the Prussians at Sombreffe on that day, 'if he encounters them,' will clear the road as far as Gembloux, and hopes himself to reach Brussels on the next morning—namely, the 17th! Ney, therefore, had no distinct order in either despatch to fight a battle for the possession of Quatre Bras.

The instruction to do this was dated 2 o'clock P.M. Mr. Hooper remarks, that it was addressed to Ney 'at Gosselies,' and is thus a proof that Napoleon did not expect him to be then at Quatre Bras. The explanation is obvious. Since the date of

the previous order to Ney, Napoleon had learnt that the Allies were resolved to contest the line between Nivelles and Namur, at Sombrefe and at Quatre Bras. But even then he speaks of the Prussian army in line at Sombrefe and Ligny as 'a body of troops.'

There can be no doubt, therefore, that he at first relied upon his sudden irruption between the two armies, by way of Charleroi, to terrify both commanders, to drive the one on the Rhine, the other on the Scheldt, and to afford him quiet possession of Brussels. This was not merely to underrate his enemies, and misjudge their strategy: it implied as great an overestimate of his own rapidity of movement. It may seem unjust to impute to Napoleon the delay and hesitation that M. Quinet and Colonel Charras have so freely charged on him. But it is certain that his advanced divisions were awaiting his orders during the whole morning of the 16th; nor is this delay surprising, since his despatches to Ney evince that his assumptions of the movements of the enemy chiefly rested on erroneous hypotheses of his own. In place of being at Brussels on the morning of the 17th, his troops were so much exhausted by the affair at Ligny, that they could not march even from that field of battle till noon.

M. Thiers insists, however, that up to the night of the 16th, the scheme of Napoleon had been completely successful. He had separated the two armies, and the Prussians had lost 30,000 men. Ostensibly, no doubt, he had succeeded; for both armies on the day following were retreating. But he had not destroyed their effective combination; for they were reunited within forty-eight hours at Waterloo. Nor had Blücher probably suffered more than two-thirds of the loss here ascribed to him. M. Thiers describes 12,000 Prussians as deserting after the battle. But that is incredible, since Blücher was not pursued, and leisurely retreated in the dusk. Assuming that the losses in battle were nearly equal, they could be worse afforded by Napoleon, for he was numerically inferior. And if we turn to Quatre Bras, we find that the Duke held the position.

No doubt risks were run on both sides. It has been judged imprudent in Blücher to give battle before he could be directly supported either by Wellington or the reserve of his own army. For by falling back on an interior line, the Allies might have concentrated 200,000 men to fight their first general action, or even on the morning of the 17th they might have concentrated 180,000 between Quatre Bras and Ligny. But if Blücher were to defend the Namur road at all, he could no more postpone than accelerate an attack, the hour of which depended upon the French. If this criticism has any foundation, it falls equally

on him and the Duke for attempting to defend that line. It was by an error on the other side that the corps of d'Erlon was marched and countermarched between Quatre Bras and Ligny during the two battles, without firing a shot. M. Thiers describes this incident as 'a fatality;' but he will meet with such fatalities on both sides.

The details of the action at Quatre Bras in this history are ridiculous enough. The 42nd, 44th, 69th, and 33rd English regiments are described some as having been broken through, others as cut to pieces. But we are quite ready to rest the valour and success of these regiments, with all the losses they sustained, on Captain Siborne's long-accepted narrative of the battle. A glance at the opposite statements of Thiers and Siborne will be enough for an English reader. No doubt the Belgian and Nassau troops gave way both here and at Waterloo; and we will charitably hope that M. Thiers, in exaggerating the pressure put on some English regiments, has not deliberately transferred the history of our confederates to ourselves.

An illustration of the contrast between Thiers and Siborne may be taken, in few words, from the account which either writer gives of the cavalry charge at Genappe, during the retreat of the 17th upon Waterloo. The first charge upon the French lancers was made by our 7th Hussars; and it is acknowledged that this contest was unequal in strength and doubtful in result; for the lancers were flanked on either side by the houses of the street, and the hussars were meanwhile exposed to the fire of a French battery. Lord Uxbridge then withdrew the hussars and ordered the 1st Life Guards to charge the French lancers, who were then advancing up the slope against the retiring hussars, and shouting 'En avant, en avant.' Here is the account given by M. Thiers:—

'A son tour Lord Uxbridge, à la tête des gardes à cheval, chargea nos lanciers et les ramena. Mais nos cuirassiers fondant sur les gardes à cheval les forcèrent de se replier. En quelques minutes la route fut couverte de blessés et de morts, *la plupart ennemis*. Notre canon surtout avait jonché la terre de débris humains qui étaient hideux à voir.' (P. 159.)

Let us turn to the account given by Captain Siborne:—

'The Life Guards now made their charge. It was truly splendid; its rapid rush down the enemy's mass was as terrific in appearance as it was destructive in its effect; for although the French met the attack with firmness, they were utterly unable to hold their ground a single moment, were overthrown with great slaughter, and literally ridden down in such a manner that the road was instantaneously covered with men and horses, scattered in all directions.' (Vol. i. p. 273.)

French as well as English writers commonly allow that after this charge no further attempt was made to molest the retreat of the Duke's army. That acknowledgment forms at least a presumption of the accuracy of Siborne and the error of Thiers.

The manner in which the ostensible successes of the 16th were followed up on the 17th implies how little Napoleon had really gained by them. At Ligny, indeed, he kept the field. But, however paradoxical the assertion may seem, the French were put more *hors de combat* than the Prussians. Gneisenau, who commanded during Blücher's illness, had effected during the night so rapid and skilful a retreat, that on the next morning he was beyond reach of observation. The French, however—according to Soult and the Emperor himself—were so exhausted, as we have seen, that they could not be put in motion until near noon on the following day. M. Thiers, unwilling to acknowledge this, affects to explain the delay of Napoleon in marching upon Quatre Bras on the ground that a more rapid advance would only hasten the retreat of the English! He also again censures Ney, at p. 154., for not meanwhile renewing the action there; though he has admitted, at p. 121., that Ney stood in the numerical inferiority of 16,000 to 40,000; and, in point of fact, although Ney had double the force which M. Thiers assigns him, Wellington had then concentrated a much larger force. Ney, therefore, already driven back on the previous day, could not again attack without the support of the main army.

The only criticism which can be maintained against the tactics of the French at this stage of the campaign falls upon Napoleon himself. He made no attempt until noon on the 17th to ascertain the direction the Prussians had taken. M. Thiers asserts that he gave orders for the pursuit on the very evening of the battle. But of this there is no evidence; and the presumption to the contrary is irresistible. The written instructions to Grouchy, which are dated from Ligny on the 17th, bear internal evidence of being the first; for they prescribe the force that he is to command, and enjoin him to advance on Gembloux, which must have been his first march from Ligny. M. Quinet and Colonel Charras are as anxious to censure Napoleon for this delay, as M. Thiers is to exaggerate his activity. But if the French were not in condition to advance in force until noon on the 17th, there was probably no time lost by the postponement of this order to Grouchy. That consideration, however, could not preclude the earlier execution of a reconnoissance which would probably have informed Napoleon of Blücher's line of retreat. The reason of this neglect is

obvious. Napoleon thought that the Prussians would give him no more trouble for the present. The error was a fatal one, for it led him to miscalculate the movements of Blücher until it was too late to counteract them.

M. Thiers does not scruple to say, that the resolutions now taken by the hostile generals were very much what Napoleon desired; though the Emperor, on the morning of the 17th, so completely misjudged them, that, while doubtful whether Blücher had not fallen back on Liège, he was expecting to crush Wellington at Quatre Bras on the afternoon of the 17th. The latter proposition is made clear by Soult's despatch to Ney, from Fleurus, on the morning of that day. Meanwhile the Duke—according to M. Thiers—held such imperfect communications with Blücher, that he received, at last, no certain intelligence of his defeat, and retreated upon Waterloo under the mere hypothesis of the Prussians having fallen back on an interior line:—

‘N'ayant rien reçu de Maréchal Blücher, soit que celui-ci fût mécontent de n'avoir pas été activement secouru, soit que son affreuse chute de cheval l'eût empêchée de vaquer à ses devoirs, le général Britannique avait supposé que les Prussiens étaient vaincus, surtout en voyant de tout part les vedettes Françaises tant aux Quatre Bras que sur la chaussée de Namur.’ (Pp. 167-8.)

The fact is, that the intelligence of Blücher's movements reached the Duke of Wellington between 5 and 6 o'clock in the morning, and at least five hours before Napoleon had begun his march from Ligny upon Quatre Bras. On this point we may relate the following conversation, which we have from the distinguished general officer who held it with the Duke on the morning of the 17th. About an hour after sunrise, the Duke rode up to our informant and borrowed his glass, in order to examine more closely a threatening movement of the enemy, adding the words: ‘Very odd I hear nothing from old Blücher.’ ‘Haven't you heard from him, Sir, since the end of the battle?’ was the reply. ‘No; not a word,’ rejoined the Duke; ‘don't know what has become of him.’ While the Duke and our informant were scrutinising the movement which the enemy was then making, an aide-de-camp, covered with mud as his horse was covered with foam, rode up to the Duke and said a few words, of which the only one distinguishable to a bystander was ‘Wavre,’ as the aide-de-camp pointed in that direction. The Duke then turned round to the gallant officer with whose glass he had been watching the march, and said with a coolness which implied that the intelligence hardly concerned him: ‘Old Blücher has had a damned good licking.’ His companion

expressed his surprise and regret. 'Gone back to Wavre,' the Duke added, 'twenty miles off; and I suppose they'll say I've been licked too.' The Duke then gave orders for the immediate retreat of his army upon the plateau of Mont St. Jean, and for cavalry to form for its protection.

We now enter upon the last event of the campaign. On the 17th the die was cast on all sides. Wellington was then falling back on Waterloo; Napoleon, with the bulk of his army, following him to whatever position he might take up; Blücher retreating upon a line known to the English, but concealed from his enemy; and Grouchy, with one-third of the French army in Belgium, not yet pursuing Blücher, but endeavouring to trace his direction. Did, then, Napoleon penetrate the design of the allied generals to combine their forces in the next battle? And if so, at what place, and on what day, did he anticipate their combination? These are three distinct questions; though M. Thiers treats them as one, and asserts that Napoleon foresaw at least the contingency of the combination which actually took place.

Two of them may be answered with certainty. It is clear (1) that, on the 17th, Napoleon did not anticipate this combination, either on a day so early as the 18th, nor (2) at a point so near the two previous battle-fields as Waterloo. This may be indicated both *à priori* and *à posteriori*. It does not appear that Wellington himself, when he fell back from Quatre Bras, knew for certain where his union with Blücher could take place. The Prussian commander could scarcely make a promise for a beaten army which he had not reorganised, even if his communications with Wellington had been less meagre and indefinite than they really were. During the evening of the 17th this combination was arranged for the next day at Waterloo; but if Blücher had not then been in a position to promise it, we apprehend that the Duke would have fallen back through the forest before daybreak, in order to join the Prussians immediately in advance of Brussels. What, therefore, the Allies themselves, on this assumption, had not determined, it was at least unlikely that Napoleon should anticipate.

But the tactics and correspondence of the Emperor turn this probability into a certainty. Invading Belgium with an inferior force, he had skilfully aimed, on the 15th and 16th, to throw the bulk of his army on each enemy singly. But if we suppose that he foresaw the combination of Waterloo, we must assume that he deliberately so inverted his plan of operations, on the 17th and 18th, as to accept battle, with only two-

thirds of his army, against the main force of both his antagonists. This assumption would be an absurdity.

M. Thiers, indeed, here puts in two rejoinders. The one is, that Napoleon expected Grouchy to join him; the other, that he expected Grouchy to prevent Blücher from joining Wellington. But, on the one hand, if Grouchy had joined him, the whole French army would still have been little more than 100,000 against 150,000; and, on the other hand, he so disposed of Grouchy on the 17th that he could not have reached Waterloo on the 18th. So much for the first rejoinder. In regard to the second, it is true, of course, that Napoleon designed Grouchy's force to paralyse the Prussians; but it is quite untrue that he so disposed that force as to prevent, or even retard, their march from Wavre to Waterloo on the 18th. Had this been his aim, instead of separating himself from Grouchy at Sombreffe, and of marching him upon Gembloux, away from the allied line of concentration, he would have taken nearly his whole army with him as far as Genappe, and have thence pushed on advanced columns, by the road on the left bank of the Dyle, which might have seized the bridge of Wavre, and the cross-roads to Mont St. Jean, before Blücher could have occupied them. But in point of fact, the disposition made by Napoleon left Grouchy powerless to intercept the Prussians, when they were once in possession of the road to Wavre, even if he had sooner learnt the course they had taken. He could at best do no more than pursue them by the roads on the right of the Dyle. This river cut him off both from Napoleon and from the cross-roads to Mont St. Jean on its left bank. He could pass it only at Wavre, where Blücher must necessarily arrive before him, and where a small Prussian force would arrest his further advance.

It is certain, then, that Napoleon was surprised by the concentration of the Allies at Waterloo—and that he would have been surprised by their concentration anywhere so early as the 18th; for he had so divided his force, that he could not reunite it at that time and place, and his measures were not calculated to interrupt the Prussians on the line they took. The third question remains, did he penetrate their design of combination in the next battle, independently of place and time? We think that, until he saw the English in line at Mont St. Jean, he never fully appreciated that contingency. His first instructions to Grouchy are, '*Il est important de pénétrer ce que l'ennemi veut faire; ou il se sépare des Anglais, ou ils veulent se réunir encore pour couvrir Bruxelles.*' To ascertain this he sent Grouchy to Gembloux, whence the road diverged to Wavre, to Tirlemont, and to Namur and Liège. By the evening of

the 17th, he expected to learn which route Blücher had taken; whether, therefore, it was his intention to rejoin Wellington, or to fall away from him, upon the line of his own communications. But he failed to obtain this knowledge for three reasons: Grouchy was unequal to his task; Napoleon sent him too late; and Gneisenau, by despatching troops along various routes, baffled his penetration.

But it is clear that before Napoleon had had time to experience disappointment at the hands of Grouchy, he conceived his doubts to be cleared up from another quarter. Until the evening of the 17th he looked on everything as uncertain. Wellington was retreating he knew not on what point; Blücher, he knew not even by what route. But the English then took position on the field of Mont St. Jean. It is easy to see how readily Napoleon now adopted the hypothesis for certain, that the Allies had abandoned the scheme of a combination. He held, both then and at St. Helena, that in order to give him battle together, they ought to have fallen back through the forest of Soignies, at the rear of which the nearly parallel roads they traversed, from Gembloux to Brussels through Wavre, and from Quatre Bras to Brussels through Waterloo, at last converged. Had they done this, their union on the 19th, immediately in advance of Brussels, would have been more sure than by the cross-roads from Wavre to Mont St. Jean, on the 18th. When, therefore, the Duke had taken up the position he did, Napoleon saw that he had abandoned this obvious point of concentration. This fact strengthened his doubt, whether Blücher had taken the line of Wavre from Gembloux, which would have promised the advantage the Duke seemed to have foregone. He believed the Prussians too well beaten to fight again on the 18th, and certainly too distant to fight on that day at Waterloo. He deemed, therefore, the question cleared up, not by Grouchy, whose mission it was to do so, but by Wellington himself. Hence his satisfaction on seeing the English in line at Waterloo. The hallucination was fatal.

This confidence of Napoleon was not shaken even by the sinister report he received on the morning of the 18th. Grouchy, at 10 o'clock on the previous evening, had learnt that two columns of the Prussian army had marched on Wavre, and the rest on Perwez, towards Tirlemont. Still uncertain which route the mass had taken, he then wrote to Napoleon, that he would march by whichever road he should yet learn that the bulk of the enemy had retired. Thus Grouchy felt himself free, on the eve of the battle of

Waterloo, to march in a direction opposite to Waterloo, on his own judgment. Later in the night, however, his decision was taken to march on Sart-les-Walhain, midway between the road to Wavre and the road to Tirlemont. But Napoleon, better informed, learnt early on the 18th that a third column had also marched on Wavre. Accordingly, at 10 o'clock on that morning, he instructs Grouchy to follow these columns to Wavre, 'afin de vous rapprocher de nous.' Even in the body of a later despatch, written at 1 o'clock, while the battle was raging, the same order is given. It is certain, therefore, that even when Napoleon began the battle, he did not expect these Prussians, and still less Grouchy, to reach the field on that day.

But in a postscript to this despatch it is added, that a letter has just been intercepted announcing that the corps of Bulow was about to attack the French right flank. This was a letter to the Duke of Wellington, carried by a Prussian hussar, who had contrived to ride into a French picquet. Grouchy is then ordered not to lose a moment in joining the main army, and crushing Bulow. His instructions are thus suddenly altered; but they could not have been executed on the same day. Even then, Napoleon was not aware of the cross-march of the main Prussian army; nor even of its concentration at Wavre on the previous night. It is certain, therefore, that he did not apprehend the cross-march of any part of the Prussian army upon Waterloo on the 18th, until after he had actually engaged in the battle.

M. Thiers explains this fatal miscalculation of Napoleon — which, however, he elsewhere disputes — in a highly characteristic manner. 'Il raisonnait sans tenir compte de deux passions violentes, la haine chez le général Prussien, l'ambition chez le général Britannique.' But surely if hatred and ambition could together produce the finest military combinations, the previous victories of Napoleon might be amply explained, without any intellectual qualities to account for them!

Nor does he spare the Duke of Wellington for taking a position in front of a forest, whence he could only retreat, it is asserted, through a defile. It is seldom that successful generals are so freely criticised. Napoleon fought with a river in his rear at Leipsic, and every one condemns him. Hannibal fought with a river in his rear at Cannæ, and the world forgets the risk he ran. But in reality, this forest was well adapted to favour a retreating army. There were two paved roads for artillery and baggage; and the forest itself, being full of brushwood, would have covered infantry in column without retarding its progress. The Duke, as we

learn from one of his friends in the battle, had constructed strong field-works on the highest ground in the forest, which must have harassed, if not arrested, the advance of an enemy. The general who failed to provide for his retreat from Waterloo was Napoleon. He held but a single road in his rear, and that road ran through the narrow defile of Genappe, where the block of his waggons took place, which he had taken no measures to prevent.

M. Thiers, like every other historian of this campaign, assumes it to have been at the choice of Napoleon whether he had given battle at sunrise or deferred it until noon. The delay, he says, was resolved on in order to allow time for the ground, soaked with the night's rain, to harden. This conclusion he deplures; for had the English been attacked at day-break, they would have been destroyed before the Prussians could arrive. Whether the French cavalry could have manoeuvred earlier, or whether a large part of the infantry which had reached La Belle Alliance during the night were then rested from their march, we need not inquire. But one extraordinary incident, such as never impeded a battle before, would have prevented either army from attacking an hour before the battle actually began. The anecdote is related to us by the officer whose testimony we have previously invoked. On the evening of the 17th, the French infantry made a demonstration against the English lines. This movement led the front ranks of the English to load their muskets; and when the enemy retired, arms were piled in the usual manner; but the charges were not withdrawn. From that moment the rain fell in torrents. When the troops unpiled arms in the morning, they found that they could neither withdraw the charges nor fire the muskets. The rain had soaked the cartridge, moistened the powder, and so swelled the charge that the screw of the ramrod would not extract it. The English infantry were in as much despair as were the Belgian and Nassau squares a few hours afterwards, when attacked by the French cavalry. Their means of defence appeared to be gone. At length, a sergeant hit upon the expedient of swinging the musket round in a manner which dislodged the charge. This experiment was adopted with success along the whole line. Soon afterwards it appeared that the front ranks of the French infantry were in precisely the same difficulty. They had loaded overnight for their intended attack. At the short distance which divided the front ranks of the two armies they witnessed our final experiment, and adopted it. During an hour or more after the barrels were thus gradually cleaned,

the popping of musketry in the front ranks of both armies, in order to test the condition of each gun, was as incessant as during any part of the battle itself. The Duke, we believe, knew nothing of this danger until it was surmounted, or, at least, until it was plain that both armies were in the same predicament. We understand that on this ground the action could not have commenced on either side until 10 o'clock at the earliest.

M. Thiers begins his description of the battle of Waterloo with his customary inversion, in favour of his enemy, of the real disproportion of numbers on each side. He says that Napoleon had only 68,000 on the field, and the Duke had 75,000. These figures are simply a falsification of the figures which have long been before the world. According to Siborne, who gives his statement in detail, the French army numbered 71,947, and the motley army of the Duke no more than 67,661. In cavalry and artillery the disproportion was much greater than in the total numbers of troops of all arms. The Duke had 12,408 cavalry — of which only 5,843 were British, and the majority of the remainder Belgian — while Napoleon had 15,765. The Duke, again, had but 156 guns, and Napoleon 246. Of this disproportion in cavalry and artillery M. Thiers says nothing. If we were to accept Napoleon's own estimate of the relative strength of the two armies, we could hardly acquit the Duke of rashness in offering battle before Blücher had actually arrived. Bonaparte held each French soldier to be equal to one British, or two Hanoverians, Dutch, or Belgians. Now, less than half the Duke's army consisted of British, and the Netherland troops abandoned the field in considerable numbers during the battle. The inferiority, therefore, of the Duke's army to that of Napoleon must have been very great.

M. Thiers' account of the battle itself is a caricature of absurdity. The objects of Napoleon, in directing his various attacks, are described, indeed, fairly enough. But the results of these attacks, as they are here stated, are in almost every single instance purely imaginary. Without giving himself time to manœuvre, though he had no knowledge of the degree of hazard he ran in accepting battle at Waterloo, he resolved to force the Duke's position, and seize the great road to Brussels. He attacked, therefore, by dense masses of infantry in close column, and threw immense bodies of cavalry upon particular points in the enemy's line; but as these assaults were more imposing than destructive, and failed to break the British and German squares, they merely accelerated the exhaustion of the French

army. Since the attacks failed, the blame of the failure is thrown in each case on the general who led it. Thus the defeat of D'Erlon, which cost the French 6000 men, is ascribed to his mistake in attacking in close column, though that is well known to have been a favourite manœuvre of Napoleon. The destruction of the French cavalry is attributed to Ney, who hazarded far too large bodies of them at once. Thus from every source of disaster a hypothesis arises to shield the infallible Captain from blame. But a commander-in-chief is commonly held responsible for operations which take place under his own eye. We do not find Blücher charging his defeat at Ligny upon the misconduct of his generals in the field, nor Wellington the delay in his concentration at Quatre Bras to the incapacity of his lieutenants. If we are to believe M. Thiers, the French army at Waterloo, all the generals of which professed to venerate their Emperor, must have presented the most ludicrous picture of insubordination that ever existed. Napoleon watched his generals playing, one by one, into the hands of Wellington, and was powerless to change their tactics.

A synopsis of his results of these repeated charges of the French infantry and cavalry upon the British lines will supply the place of criticism. A great proportion, perhaps a majority, of the British standards were taken. The British infantry, which almost necessarily advanced, in consequence of the successive repulses of the French, had retrograded in position (p. 223.). The French cuirassiers broke 'very many squares' of Alten's division, and this division was thrown back on the second line. 'Many battalions of the German and Hanoverian legions' were cut to pieces, all losing their colours. 'The English cavalry was destroyed' in the early part of the battle (p. 224.). 'The first two lines of English infantry' were driven in (p. 227.). The 69th English regiment was cut in two. The 'débris of this unfortunate division of Alten' then 'took refuge in disorder on the road to Brussels.' 'Many squares,' even of the second line, were broken — the French cavalry penetrating even to the third line. Wellington, whose cavalry, a few pages before, was already destroyed, then ordered 'Cumberland's Hussars' to charge; but these hussars, at the very 'sight of this bloody arena, retreated in disorder,' carrying with them 'carriages, wounded, and fugitives on the road to Brussels.*'

* The expression 'Cumberland's Hussars,' employed without explanation by M. Thiers, suggests that an English cavalry regiment was routed. The fact is (as stated by Colonel Charras) that it was a *Hanoverian* regiment, lately raised, which bore the name of the Duke of Cumberland.

The Duke, before the close of the French charges of cavalry, had only 36,000 men left (p. 230.) of the 75,000 with which he is described as beginning the battle; so that he had lost 39,000 men before 6 o'clock, and yet held his position without succour. And when the charges of French cavalry were over, the English are described as 'with difficulty firing a few shots 'with the débris of their artillery' (p. 231.). The cuirassiers alone take six flags and sixty pieces of cannon from the English!

We certainly do not care to offer an answer in detail to this audacious and deliberate imposture. Such an answer, however, might be taken out of M. Thiers' own mouth. A single example would be sufficient. We have seen the English cavalry destroyed—circumstantially destroyed—down to the last regiment of Hussars. But at the end of the battle, when the necessity of accounting for the catastrophe circumscribes the historian's means of deviation from the truth, the cavalry of Vivian and Vandeleur are described as 'instantaneously inundating the field' (p. 240.); and M. Thiers cannot resist the contradictory bravado that they would have been 'quickly cut to pieces by the French cavalry of 'the Guard, had not the latter numbered only four hundred and 'the former three thousand' (p. 247.). Every one else, however, knows that Lord Uxbridge led more than double this number of cavalry in the final charge. There is no doubt that several Belgian regiments and the Nassauers yielded in a manner which inspired the French with illusive hopes. It is perhaps because M. Thiers feels that his paradox would be otherwise incomplete, that he transfers their shortcomings to English regiments, and praises the Belgians and the Nassauers (who shot at the Duke in their terror before the action began) for the firmness and tenacity they displayed.

M. Thiers' description of the final attack by the Guard is, however, the grossest of all his single misstatements. It is well known that two attacks were made from different quarters upon the same point, which were intended to be simultaneous, but which a miscalculation of distance separated by an interval of some ten minutes. The first column, being attacked in front and flank, broke and retreated, but endeavoured to reform; the second, attacked by the 95th, 71st, and 52nd regiments, broke and fled also. M. Thiers has surmounted his difficulty here, much as he before surmounted the difficulty touching the action at Sabougal—he has entirely expunged the second attack of the Guards from his history. He ventures to declare that the final attack, which was crushed by the fire and charge of Maitland's Foot Guards, was perfectly successful, and that the second column (which was designed to have formed part of a

simultaneous attack) was about to follow, when a 'brusque apparition' crossed the field, and a grand dissolving view of the French Empire immediately set in. This 'apparition' was produced by the cavalry of Vivian and Vandeleur, followed by the Prussians, who covered the whole plain, and destroyed that Imperial Guard which would die but not surrender! Thus, according to M. Thiers, the victory won by the Duke was narrowly snatched from an impending defeat; the first column of the Imperial Guard were unscathed, and even successful; the second had not advanced to the attack, when this 'brusque apparition of Ziethen' instantaneously turned a triumph into a disaster. The attempt, then, of one of the most ingenious of French writers to prove that the English would have been defeated at Waterloo but for the intervention of Blücher, is only to be worked out by a grotesque misrepresentation of the most certain incidents of the battle.

From the moment of the rout of the Old Guard, the resolution of the Duke was taken to attack the whole line of the enemy. His sense of dependence on the Prussians was much less than that of some of his generals. We have it from an eminent survivor of the battle, who was with the Duke and Lord Uxbridge at this crisis, that on the Duke giving the order of attack, Lord Uxbridge urged him to wait until the Prussians were more in condition to support a general advance. The Duke turned round, and answered in good humour, 'No: in for a penny, in for a pound: it's my turn now.' But Lord Uxbridge, not content with this reply, ventured to remonstrate again. The Duke then rose in his stirrups, looked Lord Uxbridge sternly in the face, and said, very angrily, 'Do you suppose, Sir, I don't know how to command an army?' Lord Uxbridge at once left the Duke to command his army, rode off to lead the last cavalry charge, and lost his leg.

It is remarkable that none of the Duke of Wellington's eager and innumerable detractors have substantiated a single criticism on his command during the battle itself. The tactics of Napoleon on the field have experienced, on the other hand, a very different reception, even among French writers. The Duke's general plan of campaign, no doubt, has been freely censured; and we have attempted to show what that censure is really worth. One criticism certainly appears to bear the test of inquiry. The Duke retained at Hal, throughout the battle of the 18th, the 17,000 men he had stationed there to prevent the French from turning his right, and taking Brussels in his rear. He held that this would have been Napoleon's best move after the battles of the 16th; and Napoleon himself has not

ventured to dispute it, though profounder strategists like M. Thiers are quite ready to do so. But on the morning of the 18th, when the French army was in line at Waterloo, Colonel Charras maintains, with some reason, that the Duke ought to have recalled this force. Possibly, however, the Duke's answer to this criticism would have been, on the one hand, that he fought the battle in reliance upon the succour of the Prussian army; and on the other, that as he had no precise knowledge of the extent of the French army, he was still ignorant whether his communications might not at the same moment be threatened at Hal.

The question whether the Duke would have held his ground, or Napoleon have succeeded, if the Prussians had not arrived, is one on which English and French writers, we suspect, will ever be at variance. French pride will never admit the former hypothesis. It would be no slur, indeed, on the courage of the English or the tactics of the Duke, if we were to acknowledge the latter. The Duke's army was vastly inferior in organisation to the French, whether we look to its nationality, its training, or its artillery; and it was also somewhat less in numbers. It formed no part, as we have seen, of Wellington's tactics to give battle at all, without the support of the Prussians. According to accepted strategy, the highest credit of a general rests, not in gaining a battle with inferior numbers on the field, but in so manœuvring as to bring a great superiority of numbers to that decisive point. This is precisely what Wellington and Blücher achieved. When, therefore, M. Thiers depreciates the victory of the Allies, by falsely representing Waterloo as a contest between 68,000 and 140,000, he simply describes his own hero outgeneralled in the first principles of military tactics.

But it is clear that we should have held our ground, and it is probable that we might have driven the enemy from the field, without the support of the Prussians. It is acknowledged by M. Thiers that Napoleon had but 400 cavalry at the close of the action, and that the Imperial Guard, which executed the two last attacks, were his only reserves of infantry. Both these columns were defeated and driven back, without any support from the advanced Prussian division of Ziethen. Even, therefore, if the Prussians had not arrived at that juncture, Napoleon would have had no means of continuing the battle. And although the Duke acknowledges that their arrival was an element in his resolution to make a general attack, it seems indisputable that, even if they had not then appeared, the result of the attack, had he made it, would have been the same. The Duke himself states that 'the battle was terminated by an

‘ attack which he determined to make on the enemy’s position, ‘ in which he does not report that any Prussian troops joined, ‘ because, in point of fact, none were in that part of the field ‘ of battle.’ The division of Bulow, which had separated from the main army, and threatened Planchenoit in the rear of the French, no doubt rendered the Duke indirect assistance, by drawing off a portion of the enemy’s force. But the support which the main strength of the Prussians, under Blucher, as they emerged from the woods of Ohain, were in time to afford, lay chiefly in their presence; for they had but just engaged the extreme right of the French army when Wellington cleared the field. They however rendered complete and decisive a victory, which probably might have been attained, if it had been attempted, without them.

• It is very consistent with the character of this history and with the idolatry of the historian, that these twenty volumes should terminate in a simple biography. The dignity of the work declines in sympathy with the fallen fortunes of the hero who has been identified throughout with the Consulate and the Empire. It might indeed be plausibly taken as an instance of the factitious demarcations of history and biography, and be cited throughout as an example in point of Bolingbroke’s rule, that perfect biography represents the life of one whose history has been to some extent the history of the world. In this new vocation of delineating private life, which we term biography as contradistinguished from the delineation of public affairs, M. Thiers has been extremely successful. That perhaps is not surprising. The writer who can give life, though often with a distorted countenance, to dry records, despatches, muster-rolls, to the complex machinery and elaborate routine by which a mighty government in a condition of incessant activity is maintained, cannot fail to impart it also to the events of individual life, even where there is little incident to diversify his picture.

But it is more than we anticipated to find M. Thiers dealing with the melancholy chapter of Napoleon’s exile with so much impartiality. Other French writers, who have been less the panegyrists of Napoleon, and less again the detractors of this country than M. Thiers, have indiscriminately attacked us for sending Napoleon to St. Helena, as well as for every circumstance of his treatment there. To be sure, M. Thiers has just had his revenge. He has broken our squares, captured our standards, destroyed our cavalry, spiked our guns; done everything, in fact, that could avenge his countrymen for defeat. He can afford perhaps now to treat us with equanimity and justice.

But it is a remarkable instance, nevertheless, of his fair dealing and good sense, that he acknowledges our justification in sending Napoleon to St. Helena, and in detaining him there for the remainder of his life. The passage in which he records this conviction is transcribed, not by reason of any striking acumen that it displays, but as an instance of the triumph of reason over vindictiveness in the mind of the most wayward and commonly the most prejudiced of French contemporary historians. He thus writes, after describing the anomalous position in which Napoleon stood on his surrender to Captain Maitland:—

‘The most learned lawyers in England, being consulted on this occasion, exhibited embarrassment enough. However, in the face of the peace of the world, ever menaced by Napoleon, this embarrassment could not last long. Our character of Frenchmen, in preserving to us a sympathy very natural for the old companion of our glory, ought not to lead us to ignore an obvious truth that Europe, overthrown during twenty years, but just now disturbed again in its repose, and compelled to pour out torrents of blood, could not forego her right of guaranteeing herself against new enterprises, always to be apprehended, of the boldest genius. Had it been the case of a sovereign dethroned by the common course of events, like Louis XVIII., the duties of hospitality would have required that he should be left to choose in free England a place where he might quietly end his career. But to allow the man to walk about the streets of London who had escaped from the Island of Elba, and called together the armies of Europe in the lists of Ligny and Waterloo, was impossible. If States are bound to protect each other’s life, they have equally the right to defend their own; and the English lawyers might have recourse with reason to the principle of legitimate defence, which authorises each to look to its own safety when clearly menaced. Every society restrains characters known to be dangerous; and all Europe, France included, having experienced beyond measure how far Napoleon was dangerous to her, had the right to disarm him of the means of injury.’ (Pp. 562–63.)

No reasoning can be more dispassionate and just. M. Thiers also acknowledges that the choice of St. Helena combined the utmost regard to the personal comfort of Napoleon that a deference to this necessity rendered possible. He implies even that the alternative was to immure him in a fortress. He acknowledges that the climate was not unhealthy, and that, if life there was monotonous, to give him a prison proportionate to his former energy, would have been to restore to him the world itself.

These liberal admissions, however, as might be suspected, are the prelude to a severe, but not undeserved, attack on the details of his treatment. With equal candour, we acknowledge that

much of that attack is not ill founded; and that the treatment of Napoleon at St. Helena is a lasting reproach to the Government of that day, and to its agents. M. Thiers proceeds to say that the rights which he has conceded to the Powers of Europe 'could not extend to the length of annoying and humiliating 'Napoleon.' It may be true that there was no annoyance or humiliation inflicted on Napoleon without a distinct reason to account for it. But many of those annoyances, though nominally defensible, were not necessary to the main object of his security; and were therefore harsh, ungenerous, and impolitic.

Thus M. Thiers begins by complaining that the title of Emperor was refused to Napoleon. This, perhaps, is his weakest point. His argument is that the title was acknowledged by Fox in 1806; by Castlereagh himself at Châtillon in 1814, and again at Elba. But he forgets that the invasion of France afterwards put Napoleon, by declaration of Congress, beyond the law of nations; and he even censures the British Government 'for contesting the title by which posterity would recognise him.' It does not occur to him to point out how the English ministers in 1815 could anticipate the voice of posterity, which he, living in 1862, has the advantage of hearing around him. But in spite of this absurdity, we freely admit that it would at least have been more graceful than illogical, more soothing to the exile than injurious to the cause of the settlement of 1815, to have conceded to his misfortunes the title which so extraordinary a man had asserted in his glory.

We fully agree with M. Thiers in his opinion that the recriminations between Sir Hudson Lowe and Napoleon, on the miserable subject of the expenditure of Longwood, were deplorable; and that the conduct of the late Lord Bathurst, in causing these paltry disputes, in the hope of saving a few thousands a year, was inexpressibly mean. Indeed, the restrictions imposed upon Napoleon, before he sailed from England, though again defensible under a certain show of reason, were contemptible and injudicious. Thus he was ordered to surrender his sword, on the theory that he was a prisoner of war; yet no one can deny that this measure conveyed a wanton degradation: and the result was, that when Napoleon refused to surrender it, Lord Keith, in defiance of his orders, allowed him to retain it. Again, the Emperor was required to surrender his money and jewels, on the ground that, in his own hands, they might facilitate his escape. But the precaution, whatever may be thought of it, was nugatory, for the bulk of the treasure was concealed, and in this manner retained. When Napoleon reached St. Helena, the best residence in the island ought to

have been secured for him. This was Plantation House, but the Governor, and not the Emperor, was allowed to reside in it. Many restrictions, however, against which Napoleon chafed,—as, for example, that he was followed by a mounted officer when on horseback,—were necessary to his safe detention; but between his irritable temperament and Sir Hudson Lowe's want of tact and good feeling, the detention of Napoleon at St. Helena offers scenes which no man can now look back upon without regret, not more for his sake than for our own.

We cannot take leave of this voluminous and important work—to which M. Thiers has devoted so many years of his life, and which he doubtless regards as the most lasting monument of his fame—without once more expressing our admiration for the unflagging vivacity with which he has accomplished this prodigious task. The last hundred pages of the twentieth volume, in which he compares the military genius of Napoleon with that of the greatest commanders of all ages, is a masterpiece of style, which gives novelty and interest to the subject of every schoolboy's theme. But this tribute to the literary genius of the author is grievously impaired by the evidence, which it has been our duty on several occasions to produce, of the want of accuracy and sincerity pervading the whole work. Nay more, we are bound to say that this book is, from first to last, tainted by an absence of that moral sense which is the salt of history; and we lament to perceive that its chief object and effect appear to be to diffuse amongst the French people those democratic and military passions which have more than once plunged them in servitude at home, and incited them to conquest abroad. French imperialism is the beginning and the end of M. Thiers's literary labours; and it is a very inadequate punishment for the mischievous tendency of his writings, that he is proscribed as a politician by the very power to which he has so unscrupulously devoted his pen.

- ART. VI. —1. *Histoire des Institutions de Moïse et du Peuple hébreu.* Par JOSEPH SALVADOR. Troisième édition, revue et augmentée d'une introduction sur l'avenir de la question religieuse. Deux tomes. Paris: 1862.
2. *Jésus-Christ et sa Doctrine. Histoire de la Naissance de l'Eglise, de son Organisation et de ses Progrès pendant le premier Siècle.* Par JOSEPH SALVADOR. Deux tomes. Paris: 1838.
3. *Histoire de la Domination Romaine en Judée, et de la Ruine de Jérusalem.* Par JOSEPH SALVADOR. Deux tomes. Paris: 1846.
4. *Paris, Rome, Jérusalem; ou la Question Religieuse au XIX^e Siècle.* Par JOSEPH SALVADOR. Deux tomes. Paris: 1860.
5. *Les Juifs en France, en Italie, et en Espagne. Recherches sur leur Etat depuis leur Dispersion jusqu'à nos Jours, sous le rapport de la Législation, de la Littérature et du Commerce.* Par J. BÉDARRIDE, Bâtonnier de l'Ordre des Avocats à la Cour Impériale de Montpellier. Paris: 1859.
6. *Jüdisch Mosaischer Religionsunterricht für die Israelitische Jugend.* Von SALOMON PLESSNER, Religions-lehrer. Berlin: 5599 (1838).
7. *Gebetbuch für Jüdische Reformgemeinden.* Berlin: 1859.
8. *Historical and Critical Commentary on the Old Testament, with a New Translation.—Genesis.* By M. M. KALISCH, Ph. D., M.A. London: 1858.
9. *The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ. An Introduction to the History of Christianity.* From the German of JOHN J. S. DÖLLINGER, Professor of Ecclesiastical History to the University of Munich. By N. DARNELL, M.A., late Fellow of New College, Oxford. Two volumes. London: 1862.

FIFTEEN years ago we had occasion to notice Mr. Disraeli's extravagant estimate of the endowments and prerogatives of the Jewish race, and his high-flown expectations of what it is yet destined to effect. We are as little disposed as ever to share such expectations; nor are we much more able to acquiesce in M. Salvador's views on this matter, though they are based on a sounder knowledge, restricted to juster limits, and recommended by a far more genuine enthusiasm. Still it

is impossible to doubt that, besides the one incomparable benefit which it has been the medium of communicating, the Jewish race has rendered many signal services to mankind; nor can any one presume or desire to say that the sum of these services has been completed. To this subject we desire to direct attention now. We shall decline altogether to enter into the question of the future of Israel, regarded in a supernatural light. We leave in other hands the investigation and interpretation of Scriptural predictions; taking no other guide in such remarks as we shall make but the facts of history and the laws of analogy. Viewed in such a light, and on grounds common to Jewish and to Christian observers, there is much in the subject which deserves very serious consideration; and the phenomena at present prevailing among the Jews are far less known, in this country at least, than we think they ought to be.

It is still the ordinary impression amongst us that nothing is more unchangeable than the Jewish mind — nothing more impregnable to argument and progress. We imagine them a people wrapped in superstitious prejudices, and tied to a traditionary creed, which many Christians regard as a judicial infliction; a creed only partially based upon their own Scriptures, and as inconsistent in many ways with those Scriptures themselves as it is contradictory to our Christian belief; a creed destined, moreover, to remain unaltered till a higher hand than man's shall work the change. But when we come to examine the real facts of the case, we find this creed everywhere in a state of fermentation and flux: new doctrines prevailing, new practices arising, new points of contact occurring with other creeds, new desires disclosing themselves for approximation of belief or candid interchange of thought with their Gentile brethren. Nor need this surprise us, were it not for our own preconceived notions. It is only what might be expected. It is but the old story of the storm and the sunshine in the fable. The cloak which was once clasped the closer under the keen blasts of persecution and contempt is now unloosed, if not actually laid aside, under the more kindly influence of sympathy and respect. The cloak, and something more also — perhaps in some cases too much. But we will not anticipate.

Thus far, then, we have but noticed what might reasonably have been expected, and what, indeed, has in some measure been experienced before at similar epochs in the Jewish annals. But the spectacle, pleasing in itself, acquires a fresh interest when we remember, moreover, what is not so obviously to be calculated on (though strictly in accordance with analogy also),

that just at the very periods when phenomena somewhat similar were discernible, have Jewish influences reacted most strongly on the surrounding Gentiles. Is any such reaction to be expected now? And, if so, of what nature, and in what degree? Before attempting an answer to these questions, we purpose to review briefly the history of the past.

The cloak of which we spoke just now is, of course, the Talmud. Long believed by all, and still for the most part by the orthodox Jews, to have an authority absolutely divine, it has for some time past been losing its hold upon the more enlightened and thoughtful members of the Hebrew body. Time was when no approximation could be attempted between Jews and Christians upon this subject. Even its date and origin were points of irreconcilable difference. Now, and indeed for some time past, there has been an almost entire agreement between enlightened Jewish and Christian scholars on the purely critical parts of the question. The *Mischna* itself, the text or nucleus of the Talmud, was finally arranged and reduced to its present form by Rabbi Judah, 'the Holy,' about the end of the second century; though it is still a point very diversely determined whether parts of it had been committed to writing as early as the Babylonish Captivity, or whether this was first attempted by the school of Hillel at the beginning of the Christian era, or not till after the destruction of Jerusalem, by the doctors of the school of Tiberias. In any case, it is unquestionable that the traditions and precepts of which it is composed date in part from times anterior to Christ, and had been preserved in a school of oral doctors singularly tenacious and careful of the deposit. The *Gemara*, or commentary on the *Mischna*, completing the Talmud properly so called, is of various dates from the commencement of the third century till the end of the fifth, the Babylonian Talmud not having been completed till about that time.

It is something to have attained agreement thus far; though even thus, of course, Jews and Christians are left as much at issue as ever with respect to the authority to be conceded to the Talmud. Even amongst the Jews themselves this is a point most variously determined, and the principal source of manifold internal divisions; it being obviously possible to admit the conclusions we have recapitulated, questioning, moreover, or denying altogether the Mosaic origin of the oral tradition (which is the ancient orthodox view), and yet to maintain the authority of the Talmud in undiminished force, just as a Roman Catholic maintains the infallibility of the dogmas and the binding nature of the decrees of the Church, whatever be

the date of their promulgation. But a large and increasing number of the Jewish body have come to entertain sentiments on this point also, hardly distinguishable from those of Christian scholars. While the latter have learned to repudiate not only the fanatical horror of the Middle Ages, but also the merciless ridicule of more recent times, and to see in the Talmud (besides its contradictions, absurdities, indecencies and immoralities) a valuable store of illustration and help for the study of the Old Testament, the Jews on their part have learned to assume the tone of qualified praise and of reasonable apology. M. Bédarride allows it to contain 'grave errors and 'blameable opinions,' besides 'an infinity of things which an 'enlightened man and a man of good sense cannot assent to' (p. 444.); while, nevertheless, he loyally and consistently sets forth its claims to admiration and respect. And few will deny the justice of M. Salvador's remarks:—

'Les docteurs chrétiens ont puisé dans le recueil compacte qui forme l'enseignement judaïque, dans l'expression de ses débats contradictoires, plusieurs propositions mal sonnantes au point de vue de la stricte morale et de l'amour universel du prochain; ils y ont puisé une foule de raisonnements sans portée, de contes d'enfants, de pratiques dictées par le casuisme le plus étroit, le plus déplaisant, le plus ridicule. Mais, à vrai dire, je n'ai jamais compris qu'un grand déploiement de science fût nécessaire pour arriver à un pareil résultat. Au lieu de s'en tenir à la lettre, aux mots, et pour éviter un excès de partialité, je crois qu'il aurait suffi à ces docteurs de se reprendre aux idées, aux faits, de se replacer dans la réalité des événements.' (*Paris, Rome, Jérusalem*, vol. i. p. 424.)

The Mishna (it is well known) was compared by the ancient Jewish doctors to a *hedge*, by which the law of Moses was enclosed so as to guard against the breach of it even unwittingly. M. Salvador, applying the same figure differently, has likened it to a rampart behind which the Jews entrenched themselves for ages, preserving their nationality and distinctness intact, and guarding the germ of the religion which was at some future time to burst forth afresh, and spread its influence through the surrounding world. The whole body of the Jewish people, or at least all those who were within the compass of the Roman and Parthian Empires, seem by universal consent to have submitted to the authority of the Mishna and the Talmud. The old sects of the times of Josephus had wholly disappeared in the last struggles of the Jewish nationality, unless the Karaites, whom we find in the East, be acknowledged to be lingering remains of the Sadducees; and the doctrine of the

Pharisees of the school of Hillel became the prevailing one amongst the people of the dispersion.*

It was scarcely in the nature of things that the Jews thus circumstanced should originate any strong impulse in the minds of others, or admit any considerable development in their own case. Their destiny for century after century was little else but to *endure*, clinging with passionate obstinacy to the faith of their fathers, and shielding from the violence which sought to extinguish it the sacred fire which they had saved from their desolated altar. And a terrible fate for many centuries was theirs. It is an indelible blot on the history of the Christian Church that it should have both originated and unrelentingly maintained the fierce persecution which fell upon the people of the ancient covenant; constituting itself the executioner of the judgments which its Divine Master and His Apostles so sorrowfully foretold. The Romans, barbarous as was the vengeance they exacted, contented themselves with crushing the rebellion of their fanatical subjects, and cutting off all occasion of its recurrence: they did not carry their persecutions further, till Christian zeal lighted the flame of religious rancour, and, both under the Empire and through the long period of the Middle Ages, fanned it into intensest fury. M. Bédarride has sketched with pathos, dignity, and fairness the course of this sad history, as far as Western Europe was concerned, giving in a condensed and corrected form the facts which have been related by others, and especially by Basnage (to whose merits both he and M. Salvador bear honourable witness); and, while pointing out the peculiar malignity of the clergy, not forgetting to do justice to the Popes, who in many cases, though by no means in all, nor yet without an eye to their own advantage, interfered to protect the ancient people of God from savage and lawless rapacity. For the rest they were the victims alike of kings, nobles, and bishops; liable too, at all times, to the frantic violence of the mob, besides being exposed occasionally to more systematic massacres from Crusaders, Pastoureaux, Flagellants. M. Bédarride points out also how out of the dangers thus incurred, and the expedients suggested by their prevalence, arose many of those commercial practices and modes of facilitating business (as

* Amongst the most valuable recent contributions to the history of Jewish literature, we ought also to notice the interesting works of Dr. Etheridge, well known as the translator of the New Testament from the Peshito Syriac. Dr. Etheridge's last volume, containing the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch, deserves the careful attention of biblical scholars.

letters of credit and bills of exchange) which have so largely promoted the operations of trade; and from which the Jews, in spite of all their disabilities, reaped the principal advantage, though exposed in consequence to fresh obloquy and hatred, and above all to the reproach of usuriousness, which (as he proves) they did but partially deserve at any time, and never in a larger measure than contemporary Christian money-lenders. The invention and consolidation of the principles of commercial credit, and many other services in the extension of trade, would of themselves win for the Jews a great and not inglorious place in the history of modern civilisation, even if this were all. But this is merely a subsidiary, and in some respects an incidental contribution on their part to the welfare of society.

The share they have had in the restoration of learning and the cultivation of science, though in some measure acknowledged, is even now scarcely appreciated sufficiently. Their prominence in this respect is due to their treatment by the Mus-sulmans. This is a chapter of history which Christians must read with shame. At a time when every species of scorn and injustice and cruelty was justified by the code of Christian morals, if only exercised upon the Jews, the followers of Mahomet, though also regarding the Hebrew body as guilty of the rejection of revealed truth, had associated it with themselves in the cultivation of learning. It was through the Jews that the works of Aristotle and other productions of Grecian genius were translated into Arabic, and afterwards flowing through this channel gave rise to the scholastic philosophy of the West. It was through the Jews that the science of medicine revived — based not only on the teaching of the Greeks, but on the traditional precepts of the Talmud also: and the schools of medicine, in their turn, proved, as is well known, the cradles and nurseries of physical science. The generous conduct of the Abbassides in the East was imitated and continued by the Moorish conquerors of Spain; and the Jews of the Peninsula, an ancient and honourable race, claiming (however erroneously) a settlement in the land antecedent to the Christian era, and supposed to be guiltless, therefore (as Spaniards at one time used gladly to allow), of the blood of the Redeemer, became under their patronage, as early as the tenth century, the foremost professors throughout the West in several departments of liberal knowledge. In this portion of his work M. Bédarride has followed the guidance of his learned fellow-countrymen and co-religionists MM. Franck and Munk (both of them Members of the Institute of France); whose researches, aided by others, and especially by M. Rénan, in the same field

of knowledge, have thrown a far clearer light than was attainable before upon the important position occupied by the Jews in Western Europe during the earlier centuries of the Middle Ages. Not only was the trade of the Mediterranean principally in their hands, and in some parts almost exclusively so, but they were of great importance also as political agents, and duly valued and used as such by princes and statesmen where the prejudices of the clergy and the populace did not prevent it. In literature they were not only the conservators and transmitters of ancient science, and the conductors of Arabian learning to the nations of Christian Europe, but the universal translators, publishers, and literary correspondents through whom interchange of thought in secular matters was kept up.* Nor can a considerable share be denied them in the actual advancement of knowledge; though as investigators and original thinkers they played but a secondary part to the Arabians, and though these again did but little after all for the development of inductive philosophy and science. With their cognate branches in Southern France and Italy, especially at Montpellier and Salerno, the schools of the Jews in Spain were before all others during the tenth and two following centuries, not only in medicine but in mathematics, astronomy, metaphysics, and grammar: and they have left behind them a whole literature of their own, which culminated in the thirteenth century, including works of poetry and moral philosophy, as well as sacred criticism: and which, if little known and likely always to be neglected by the world at large, gave an impulse more or less direct to the production of those maturer masterpieces which subsequently excelled them.

Of the Jewish writers of these centuries the greatest undoubtedly was Rabbi Moses ben Maimon, usually known by his Grecified appellation of Maimonides. Stripped of its miracu-

* In the work of translation especially, M. Rénan has shown (in his *Averroès et l'Averroïsme*) that justice has never yet been done to the services of the Jews. Under the Abbassides they were certainly the principal labourers in this department, though associated with Nestorians also. Even the famous Honein [ben Isaac] was almost certainly a Jew. Their activity as translators into Latin at a later period can only be appreciated by those who have inspected the MSS. of the Escorial Library. Here, too, the credit of the work has been usurped by others; by Michael Scott, for instance, who availed himself, with little acknowledgment, of the labours of his Jewish secretary, and of the work which had been done long before him. It was nearly a century before Michael Scott, that Raymond, Archbishop of Toledo (1130—1150), set the first example of the cultivation of Arabic and Greek philosophy, employing Jewish translators principally for the purpose. (*Averroès*, pp. 156-73.)

lous legends, the life of this great man is soon told. Born at Cordova in 1135, and forced in his youth to flee from his native country by a temporary outburst of persecution, under which he and his family had for some time feigned conversion to Islamism, he found a refuge in Africa, and at last safety and full liberty of conscience at the court of Saladin in Egypt, who appointed him his physician. There he seems to have spent the remainder of his days, renowned for his professional skill, and revered as a philosopher by the Mussulmans as much as by his own people. But it is as a theologian and expositor of the Scripture that Maimonides was most remarkable; at least it is in this character that his influence has been deepest and most enduring. Indeed it is to him that we can trace all the impulses which have since stirred and modified the Hebrew mind, all the movement which has introduced the later phases and progressive development of Mosaism. Without controverting the authority of the Talmud, and while accepting, indeed, and in his early works (those on the *Mischna*) repeating and upholding, the most extravagant accounts of its origin and nature, he yet taught his co-religionists to apply the laws of sound reason and enlightened knowledge to the study of theology and the interpretation of Scripture; and placed them in a path, in pursuing which they must needs come under the perpetual influences of increasing light and advancing criticism. As a philosopher, Maimonides produced no small effect upon the great scholastic doctors of the 13th century; whilst as an expositor of Scripture and of the harmonies of reason and revelation, he has made his influence deeply felt by Christian scholars at a later period also. M. Bédarride complains, not unreasonably, of the very insufficient, and indeed unfair commendation of both Scaliger and Casaubon, that Maimonides ‘*primus inter suos nugari desiit.*’ But he should have added that of these two great scholars the first has asserted that the ‘*More Novochim* (Maimonides’ chief work) *non potest satis laudari;*’ while the second appends more specifically to a like expression of praise: ‘*Quæ sunt religionis religiosè, quæ philosophica philosophicè, quæ Talmudica Talmudicè, quæ divina divinè tractat.*’ Buxtorf and Pocock, with others of lesser name, have translated into Latin his principal works, the most remarkable of which is the ‘*More Nebouchim,*’ or *Ductor Dubitantium*, not without effect upon Christian Protestant theology; whilst among his own co-religionists he not only effected a considerable revolution of thought in his own days, dissipating or braving a host of prejudices (as, for instance, by the respect with which he ventured to treat the character and moral doctrine of Jesus Christ), but also kindling a lasting

light to which all the greater intellects of the Jewish race have ever since instinctively turned, and from which they have drawn the inspiration of their genius.

It was not without immediate opposition that this new element was admitted into Jewish traditional theology. The teaching of Maimonides was furiously condemned immediately after his death by many of the leading Rabbis, headed by those of Southern France; and it was only through the exertions of the enlightened Rabbi Kunchi and some other generous adherents that the new liberal system of thought was at last allowed to be admissible. Since then the 'Light of the East and West,' the 'Eagle of the Synagogue,' the 'Second Moses,' has taken his rightful place among the spiritual worthies of his nation, being indeed the author of the only creed or confession of faith generally recognised by the Jews; and a step in advance was taken which, however such consequences might be unforeseen or denied, has made it impossible to maintain with consistency the ancient ascendancy of the Talmud.

The progressive course of Jewish thought in Spain, interrupted at times by persecutions, both under the Christian and the Moorish princes, was at last cut short (as is well known) by the fanatical resolution of Ferdinand and Isabella, whose terrible decree of expulsion from their dominions, mitigated at first by the humane and enlightened policy of Portugal, where the exiles found a refuge, was imitated twenty years afterwards by the Portuguese sovereigns themselves; and the whole Iberian Peninsula, which had been the scene of Jewish glories unparalleled since the fall of Jerusalem, cast out the ancient race to which it owed so large a portion of its civilisation and prosperity. M. Bédarride has eloquently sketched the sad and affecting history of those days; in which the grand figure of Abarnabel, philosopher, scholar, theologian, and minister of state, stands forth like that of Daniel in the Captivity, interceding for, and suffering with, his people, though with but small success. But we must not dwell on these matters, nor on the sufferings of the Jews under the Inquisition, nor on the system of organised hypocrisy thence arising, by which, under the name of 'New Christians,' their existence was partly connived at and partly concealed in Spain, Portugal, and France, till the latter half of the eighteenth century. We have reason to know that these subjects will be more fully treated of by the Dean of St. Paul's, and we doubt not with his wonted liberality and learning, in the new edition of his 'History of the Jews,' which is already announced for publication. That portion of the work which relates to the

mediæval history of the Jews has, we understand, been greatly enlarged; and as nearly thirty years have elapsed since the first appearance of the work, we have no doubt that much additional light will be thrown on this part of the subject by the more recent researches of the accomplished author.

We must rather call attention to the new era of influences which was now opened to the Jewish people over modern Europe. The exiles from Spain and Portugal, men of education, refinement, and even of noble blood, scattered chiefly over Italy, Germany, and the Low Countries, and this at a time when the mediæval mind was opening to new thoughts and new prospects, carried everywhere a fresh impulse to learning. Their arrival did quite as much for the restoration of letters as the almost contemporary influx of the Greeks from Constantinople; and the interest thus excited was fostered by the discovery of printing, an art in which the Jews soon became among the most prominent and successful proficient. The influence of the Kabbalistic philosophy, developed notably at this time, was itself not wholly barren of useful consequences. But a result of far more unmingled good was the revived study of the Scriptures and of sacred criticism. The part borne by the Jews in preparing the Reformation is not, we think, overrated by MM. Bédarride and Salvador. It was acknowledged by both sides at the time. The students of Hebrew literature, especially the famous Reuchlin and his followers, were the immediate precursors, and, indeed, in some cases, the leaders of the Reformation in the sixteenth century; and, as the controversy deepened between Roman Catholicism and the new doctrine, it was almost as much from the Old Testament as from the New that the Reformers drew their weapons, — indeed it was upon the Old Testament most of all that they based the claims of national churches, organised under the civil government, in opposition to the power of the Papacy. That the spirit and temper of Judaism was carried too far in some, if not most, of the Reformed Churches, is what we are by no means inclined to dispute; but that it proved a mighty and salutary influence at this period, there can be no doubt, nor can there be any question that Jewish studies and Jewish teachers had powerfully contributed to the growth of Protestant theology.

We wish that it could be added that the Reformation, thus encouraged and assisted, showed an improved spirit in the treatment of those who had so promoted it. But whatever the growing justice and humanity of later times may have done, it must be confessed that Protestantism long showed itself quite as prejudiced, quite as intolerant of conscientious Judaism as its

more consistent rival; nor did the sixteenth or the following century do anything material, except in Holland, to improve the condition of its professors. In England, the decree of banishment pronounced against them in 1279, remained unrevoked, Cromwell himself being unable to procure its reversal; and in Germany the harsh sentiments entertained towards them by Luther were shared by the Protestant population in general. Shunned and even persecuted by public opinion, subjected by the law to the gravest civil disabilities, they remained a distinct and unamalgamating body, forbidden to bear their part in the common work of progress, and maintaining in consequence the hard traditional covering of defence, which also impeded the free circulation of thought and spiritual life within their own body. There is little or nothing, therefore, to be said during the period ending with the middle of the last century, either respecting the influence exercised by the Jews upon the world without, or the development of doctrine within the synagogue itself. There seems to have been some attempt made to organise a Reformed Communion in Holland; but it soon came to an end, and the only differences subsisting there, as elsewhere, in the Jewish body were those of the Spanish and the German Jews, which were little more than varieties of, ritual, or even of Hebrew pronunciation and idiom.

The greatest intellect, perhaps the only great one, which the Hebrew stock produced during all this interval, Spinoza, was driven early, by the hard ungenial system under which his lot was cast, into such refuge as he could find in philosophy as a substitute for revelation; and was soon afterwards excommunicated by the Rabbis of Amsterdam with a rancorous hatred which even attempted his life. Mistaken as it would therefore be to reckon this great genius as a true scion of the Jewish mind, we must yet pause to note the important influence which he has exercised, and is still exercising, over modern thought. No other writer has so profoundly influenced Goethe, Schleiermacher, and other leading spirits of Germany; nor would it be difficult to add to the list names nearly as great as theirs from among living authors. Indeed, he must be accounted unquestionably the father of modern rationalism, as distinguished from the light and irreligious scepticism of Voltaire. Spinoza's scepticism is both profound and devout*, proving all the more interesting

* We would recommend some of those writers, whose speculations on the Jewish Scriptures have recently excited attention, to make themselves masters of the '*Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*'

therefore to thoughtful and religious minds. Yet the very circumstances which formed him should warn others of the peculiar vice which attaches to his conclusions. Cut off by those circumstances from every religious body, he set himself, as the task of life, the duty of walking alone in the light of reason, which he believed to be also the light of God. Endowed with a mind as calm as it was powerful, and habituated to a singular command over his passions, he gave himself up, with a complete abnegation of selfish and worldly objects, to the contemplation of the Infinite; contemplation varied only by a quiet fulfilment of the humblest duties of charity and contentment. It is no small tribute to the influence of Christianity, that such a man should have become almost though not altogether a Christian. And if he arrived at some conclusions subversive apparently of all historical religion, this will not disturb those who feel the value and necessity of an historical basis for their faith. We pointed out in our last Number how readily fallacies will arise out of an inaccurate conception of the Supernatural, and even out of the inaccurate application of an idea of it justly formed. And what then can be expected from an endeavour like Spinoza's to deduce a theory of the Infinite from his own intuitive conceptions, more especially under circumstances which so powerfully affected and circumscribed the very conceptions from which he started?

The middle of the last century brings us to another name far different from that of Spinoza, and second only to that of Maimonides in the rank it occupies in Jewish doctrinal and literary annals. Moses Mendelssohn, born at Dessau in 1729, was early taken up by Lessing, and prepared by his kindly aid for the great part he bore afterwards in the creation of German literature. Uniting a fine genius with a singularly sweet and winning character in a manner very much resembling his scarcely less illustrious grandson, he was peculiarly adapted to form a link between the race to which he belonged, and the educated Christian world which had adopted him as a denizen; to be a conductor from the one to the other of the ennobling

of Spinoza, in which they will find whatever is deep and comprehensive in the criticism of these subjects. The title of the treatise is significant of its spirit and its contents, and of the mind of its author. He calls it a treatise containing certain dissertations '*quibus ostenditur libertatem philosophandi non tantum salvâ pietate et reipublicæ pace posse concedi, sed eandem nisi cum pace reipublicæ ipsaque pietate tolli non posse.*' It was Coleridge, we think, who remarked that for force and accuracy of expression the Latin style of Spinoza is unrivalled among modern writers.

influences of each. And as such it was his delight to act, while shrinking with his whole heart and soul from controversial discussions. When on one notable occasion he was publicly challenged by Lavater to abjure his faith, or to justify in the face of the world his refusal to do so, the distress which it occasioned him to compose and publish the famous letters which contained his reply, was so intense that it brought him to the brink of the grave. The candid and gentle spirit which breathes in these letters, and the respect with which, while maintaining his ground, he treated at all times the person and character of Christ, have doubtless done far more to keep open the communication between Jews and Christians than could have been effected by his conversion. This is the position, then, which Mendelssohn occupies. It is a mistake to regard him, as some have done, as a great reformer of the Jewish Synagogue. He broached no new doctrines, and scarcely indicated the way to them. The commentaries which he composed are regarded as substantially orthodox even by his co-religionists of the old stamp. Even his other works, including the '*Jerusalem*,' contain little of innovation in point of doctrine, nothing to constitute him a Reformer, being indeed rather a '*Defensio ad Nationes*' than instructions addressed to his own people. Yet certainly the remarkable movement in the Jewish mind during the last hundred years is in great part, perhaps in the chief part, due to him — to his example and persuasion in inducing his brethren to study the works of Gentile genius, and to admit the influences of modern thought; while, on the other hand, no Jew has done so much as Mendelssohn to win the consideration and respect of Christian scholars, philosophers, and statesmen.

These beneficent changes, which began to show themselves in Mendelssohn's lifetime, were hastened and powerfully extended, soon after his death, by the greatest alterative event of modern times, the French Revolution. One of the earliest measures of the Constituent Assembly was to grant emancipation and citizenship to the Jews of Southern France; and when the period of atheism had passed away, under which all religious distinctions were abolished, the old spirit of exclusivism was not suffered to prevail again. It is as creditable to the justice as to the sagacity of Napoleon I., that in reconstituting the Christian Church, he should have seized the occasion for placing the Jews also on a worthier footing. In 1806, he determined to call together the representatives, freely elected, of all the Jews in the empire: so that, after declaring unequivocally their own principles in relation to civil order and society, they might arrange with him the terms on which they were to be

admitted to all the rights of citizenship. Making all allowance for calculations of self-interest on either side, the spectacle which was thus exhibited was a truly noble one, deserving the enthusiasm with which Jewish historians record it; a great prince asking and accepting, what an ancient and illustrious race was for the first time allowed to offer, a conclusive disclaimer of the unworthy sentiments falsely imputed to it for so long. The following year witnessed a still more solemn confirmation of these proceedings. The assembly of Rabbis which Napoleon then convoked, and to which, with something of undue pretentiousness, he gave the name of the Great Sanhedrim, comprised not only the undoubted representatives of the Jews within the French Empire and the kingdom of Italy, including the descendants of the Spanish and Portuguese exiles, but was formally recognised by deputies from the synagogues of Holland, and (through Frankfort) of Germany. It was scarcely less truly a general council of the Jewish Church than that of Nicea was of the Christian; and its decisions, though not formally admitted by the whole Israelitish body as universally binding, were confidently uttered in the name of all, as the legitimate and unquestionable expression of their belief. These decisions do not touch upon points of theology, properly so called; but define the doctrine of the Jews upon polygamy, divorce, and intermarriage with Christians, upon duties towards non-Israelite governments and individuals, upon trades and professions, and loans on interest; the principle running through the whole being that all the political regulations of the Mosaic law are by their very nature incidental and temporary; and that every conscientious Jew is bound to obey the laws and promote the welfare of the particular country to which he now belongs, giving it his full allegiance, and owning no other national tie. On this understanding, the Jews were confirmed by Napoleon in the possession of the rights of citizenship, though with some temporary disqualifications difficult to account for; their religion was invested with a public and legalised character: and their ecclesiastical arrangements placed under the cognisance and protection of the State. Many of them rose accordingly under the Empire to positions of honour both in the military and the civil services. And the privileges then granted have never subsequently been withdrawn; on the contrary, the remaining restrictions which had been imposed on them were allowed to drop under the government of the Restoration till, in 1830, the last point was conceded also by the State—payment of their ministers of religion, and the Jewish worship has taken its place

by the side of the Protestant, as a quasi-legitimate branch of the French National Church.

Nor is it in France only that the legislation of Napoleon in this matter has maintained its ground. Belgium and Holland have never withdrawn the privileges which they had once conceded; and if Italy at first did so, the kingdom of Sardinia, drawing with it now the whole liberated Peninsula, has subsequently restored them. In all these countries (to which, in civil matters at least, we may now add England also, not forgetting, besides, the States of America) the Jews are placed on a complete level of equality with their Christian fellow-subjects.

In Germany, too, though more slowly and imperfectly, the work of emancipation has made and is making progress. Even before the French Revolution, Joseph II. had begun it in his dominions; and much has been done since then in Northern Germany also. The effects of the Liberation War were considerable in raising the condition of the Jews; many of whom served in the liberating armies, while others made large fortunes in those troubled times by a dexterous use of the opportunities presented to them, and succeeded also in obtaining the privilege, till then denied them, of acquiring and holding real property.

The consequence has been, as was natural and necessary, that in all these countries, and most of all where emancipation has been most complete, the prejudices and exclusive sentiments which separated the Jews from their fellow-subjects have given way, and are disappearing. The barriers maintained by Rabbinism, strong in the last century, and at one time even increasing in strength, under the revival of the system proceeding from the schools of Bohemia, Hungary and Poland, are now in some places almost effaced, and in all rapidly losing their restrictive power. The extravagant claims of the Rabbis, and even of the Talmud, to respect and deference, are sensibly weakened among the Jews of civilised Europe; and systems more accordant with sound reason and with their own Scriptures are taking the place of the old reputed orthodoxy.

In France, singularly enough, where this movement has proceeded to the greatest length, the apparent change is the least noticeable. The French synagogues are still outwardly and professedly of the old orthodox stamp. There is no reformed body, no rival or divided communion. The consciousness of the liberty secured them in political matters, and their independence of their Rabbis, seem to have sufficed to the French Israelites; so that they are satisfied with freedom of

speech and thought, without troubling themselves to bring outward forms into a consistent shape. Like the ordinary Roman Catholic laity of that country, they are contented to tolerate and to smile at many of the ceremonies and dogmas of their hereditary religion, without caring to see them altered; while under these lingering forms, the belief of individuals (such as it is) has run to the utmost lengths of latitudinarianism. The French Jew is principally, and above all things, a Frenchman. It may be a point of honour with him to maintain the faith of his forefathers, to which he has also in many cases a proud personal attachment: but his real religion (generally speaking) is a liberal and philosophical Deism. The unbounded toleration which the French boast of in their relations to different forms of belief, not unfrequently arises from equal indifference to every one of them.

In our own country, where social distinctions outlive particular ones, and still keep the Jewish body very much apart from the rest of the nation, and where denominational differences also are in all creeds maintained with greater precision and earnestness, a feeling of dissatisfaction with the old traditional system has long prevailed among the Jews, which resulted twenty years ago in the formation of a separate Reformed Synagogue. The leading principle of this body is the recognition of Scripture as supreme in doctrinal matters and religious ordinances; though a deference is also professed to Rabbinical traditions which may seem hardly consistent with that position. In their worship they adhere on the whole to the ancient Hebrew ritual; though omitting the Chaldee portions, and otherwise revising and abridging it, removing the emblems of mourning from the synagogues, altering the hours of divine service, and assigning an important place to the work of preaching. They have also introduced the rite of Confirmation for young persons, admitting girls moreover to its benefit. These principles are well expounded and defended by Mr. Marks in a volume of sermons preached at the West London Synagogue, in which various moral and doctrinal subjects are handled with a good sense and a sober religious feeling which hardly ever contravene, though they may not always satisfy, the convictions of the Christian reader. Even in the older community, among individuals, if not in the whole body, a more enlightened view of the authority of the Talmud is gaining ground. And we are glad to learn that the denunciations of heresy with which the Reformed Synagogue was at first assailed by its co-religionists, and notably by the late Chief Rabbi Herschel, are now rarely to be heard; while not only is there a greater cordiality

between the members of the two synagogues, but even inter-marriage and personal intercourse between their office-bearers.

The Jews of Holland and Belgium are, doctrinally as well as politically, very much in the same condition as those of France; though exhibiting, it would seem, with their outward orthodoxy, a still more complete indifference to consistency of doctrinal tenets. It is to Germany that here, as elsewhere, we must look for the most carefully and consistently elaborated systems of theology. Among the German Jews there exist, we understand, five religious parties; each represented by synagogues of its own, and ecclesiastically as well as doctrinally distinct.

1. The *Talmudically Orthodox* party, strictly adhering to all the precepts of tradition; though showing in many ways (as in the education of women, and in the vastly enlarged sphere of learning now embraced) the effect of the influences of which 'the world-wise' Mendelssohn was the channel.

2. The *New Orthodox* party, clinging equally to the ancient ritual; but which, though acknowledging the validity of tradition, consider historical disquisitions on its origin legitimate, and admit such modifications as the results of their researches warrant. This school is said to be distinguished for learning and honesty of purpose, though necessarily uncertain and fluctuating, and often inconsistent in its conclusions.

3. The *Biblical Jews*, taking on the whole the Old Testament as their guide, and not binding themselves to the dicta of the Talmud, while they admit considerable reforms and abridgments also in the old Hebrew Prayer-book. They thus approach the nearest to the Reformed Jews in England, but are remarkable for a much deeper knowledge of Biblical and Jewish literature.

4. The *Older Reform Jews*, clinging to the divine authority of the Old Testament, and more especially of the Pentateuch; but freeing themselves almost entirely from the traditional rituals, introducing *German* prayers in their synagogues, and taking a more liberal view of ceremonies in general.

5. The *New Reform Jews*, dating from 1845, who may be said to have consistently carried out the ideas of the older reformers; departing still further from the ancient ritual, entirely rejecting the ceremonial law, not only of the Talmud (which they of course abandon), but also of the Pentateuch, and setting aside the precepts not only regarding the forbidden animals, but even regarding circumcision, though some members of their community still practise that rite.

It would be a laborious task, and one which few would care to follow, were we to undertake a more minute examination of

the tenets of these different schools. We will briefly place in contrast the principles of the two extremes, represented as they are respectively by the two German works which are cited at the head of this article: both of them highly characteristic in themselves, and prefaced by explicit and instructive Introductions. It is curious to compare them, and to recognise within the Christian Church the counterparts to both: the first sighing over the good old times when the Bible and the Talmud were all in all to the faithful Israelite; admitting with reluctance the modifications necessitated by modern requirements; maintaining the divine authority of the Mishna, as delivered originally to Moses, and orally transmitted, through prophets and doctors, to the time when it was fixed in writing; looking to the Advent of a personal Messiah; and meanwhile prescribing carefully the observance of personal, domestic, and congregational formalities, of rites, ceremonies, festivals, and traditional prayers suitable to every occasion: — the latter not only acquiescing in the departure of the old things which have passed away, but rejoicing and exulting in the change; looking down as from a vantage-ground of adult spiritual advancement upon the visible images of the ancient dispensation; seeking to offer nothing else to God but the reasonable service of prayer, gratitude, and obedience; and looking forward, not to a Messiah, but a Messianic time — a time of universal knowledge and virtue, which it is still the peculiar mission of the Jewish people to herald and promote.

We turn to a more detailed sketch of French Judaism, not because we think it in itself more worthy of examination (indeed very much the contrary), but because it occupies at present a far more prominent position in Europe, and also points more definitely to the proud expectations of the future which present phenomena have naturally excited in the Jewish mind.

The principal spokesman of the French Israelites, as a controversialist, is M. Salvador. Descended from the ancient Spanish stock whose lineage and history still claim an exceptional title to respect, educated among Christians, and connected also with Christians by family ties, M. Salvador has enjoyed advantages both for divesting himself of prejudices and for obtaining a hearing in the literary world, which he has used with remarkable success. His extensive learning, great ability, high character, and singleness of purpose, have gained him a very general respect in France; and his works, though marked with individual peculiarities, which we must not assign to the body he represents, are regarded with honourable pride by his

co-religionists, and may be accepted, on the whole, as the best expression that can be found of their present opinions and expectations. His works, of which we will now give a brief summary, are four in number.

In the book which stands at the head of our list, entitled '*Histoire des Institutions de Moïse*,' &c., M. Salvador argues that, in Moses we have not only the germ of all religions which can justly claim a divine origin, but the best and completest form of them which has yet appeared. Besides revealing the true nature of God and of His relations with mankind, dispelling thereby the darkness of Egyptian and other heathen systems, he has given us the justest and most pregnant principles of political, legislative, social and moral science. Long before the genius of the Greeks and Romans had developed somewhat similar results, and with a far clearer and more powerful light, he has kindled the torch by which mankind must be guided in all their efforts after progress. He has been misunderstood or misinterpreted by those who see injustice or narrowness in any of his laws. Fairly considered, they are not only good and equitable in themselves, but eminently favourable to liberty and progress. And though he himself contemplated their supplementary modification by enlightened men who should follow him, legislators and prophets, claiming to speak by the Spirit of God, still it is in the Mosaic element above all that the essential sap resides, from which enduring fruits are to be developed. The system allowed full scope for such development: only premising that some truths must be accepted as immutable. Jesus Christ erred, and was justly condemned, because He departed in the most essential particulars from the fundamental principles of Mosaism. The universal religion remains yet to be matured, out of the simple elements originally given.

Such, besides the historical summaries it contains, are the main outlines of M. Salvador's first work — an early production, the two parts of which were published originally in 1822 and 1828, and which is not much altered or enlarged in its present issue. We shall not dwell upon it long, though it has much that is just and striking amidst what we deem its glaring errors. But, besides its unshrinking rationalism, there seems to us to be an essential vice in its mode of extenuating the defects of the Mosaic law; the imperfect morality and obvious narrowness of which, acknowledged and apologised for by M. Franck, cannot (we are persuaded) be consistently accounted for, except on the ground of its typical nature, its designedly separative and repellent (not to say repulsive) character, and its necessary

accommodation to the prevailing ideas of a barbarous age and a half-civilised people. M. Salvador, too, does not do justice to the progressive development of religious and moral ideas effected through the Hebrew prophets; and still less to the greatness and originality of the work achieved by Greek and Roman genius, for estimating which (as well as the nature of Eastern religions) his learning is (or was, when he wrote the book) manifestly insufficient, contrasting very unfavourably with that of Dr. Döllinger, with which we have closed our list of authorities. His view of the trial and condemnation of Jesus Christ was combated on grounds of Jewish law by M. Dupin, in 1828; and further defended by himself in his second work. The controversy is one as fruitless, perhaps, as it is difficult to decide; for, even if we accept M. Salvador's conclusions, we should say, as Christians, that Judaism at that great crisis did but, as it were, commit suicide, betraying its own insufficiency in the presence of its destined end. More startling and more fatal to M. Salvador's consistency is his own view of Moses and the history of the Exodus. For it is more than doubtful whether he assigns to Moses any divine inspiration at all, beyond the afflatus of a world-embracing genius; and it is absolutely certain that he disbelieves his miracles, and is content to suppose that he employed them in semblance as a necessary expedient for influencing the people whom he guided. And this we are to think of the great moral regenerator of mankind! It is curious to find Bishop Colenso anticipated by a Jewish Doctor, for without the Exodus, as it is described in the Pentateuch, what becomes of the divine origin of Judaism?

2. The second work of M. Salvador—*'Jésus-Christ et sa Doctrine'*—published in 1838, is the one which Christians would open with the greatest curiosity and interest, if not deterred by the pain which they must apprehend from seeing such a subject treated by such hands. And, indeed, the pain we speak of is unavoidable; though M. Salvador, from his own point of view, has treated the subject with all possible consideration and delicacy. In his other works he pays a juster tribute to the beauty and grandeur and pathos of the character of Christ, and the surpassing excellence of His moral teaching*; and

* Take, for instance, a remarkable passage from his latest work:—*'Le Maître des Évangiles a eu la gloire de forcer les portes du ciel, afin de faire remonter les pensées de l'homme vers les régions supérieures, et d'y introduire surtout les pauvres d'intelligence. Le Maître des Évangiles a eu la gloire d'imprimer au cœur humain, à l'âme humaine, une chaleur plus profonde que le monde n'y avait été accoutumé, une exaltation plus soutenue, un sentiment de sympathie plus*

would have been willing, apparently, to concede to Him a high, if not the highest, place among Hebrew prophets, if His claims had gone no farther. But from the claims which were really advanced, whether by Him or on His behalf, M. Salvador revolts utterly; and the refutation of these claims is the object of the book before us. Granting, as he does, the general truth of the Gospel story, he subjects it to a keen and ingenious analysis, not without imputations of motives both to the Evangelists and to Christ, which seem to us quite inconsistent with his general view of their characters. The phenomenon of Christianity, and of Christ Himself, so wonderful even on his own showing, he accounts for on two grounds — natural and supernatural (if the latter word may rightly be applied to any conception which M. Salvador allows himself to form). The *natural* reasons are to be found in the alleged fact that the lofty morality and aspirations after personal holiness, of which Christ presents the highest embodiment, had been already developed in the Jewish nation, and especially among the Essenes, partly through the teaching of Hebrew doctors, partly through the philosophy of other nations, and especially the Orientals, filtered into the Jewish mind. There is absolutely nothing new, according to M. Salvador, in the Christian code of morals and devotion; as can be proved by referring to the Apocrypha, to the works of Philo, and to those parts of the Mishna which are demonstrably older than the New Testament; while many parts of the Christian system, on the other hand (especially the ascetic element and some theological doctrines), are traceable with equal certainty to a heathen, and principally to a Persian source. *Supernaturally*, the phenomenon is due to the necessity which existed for a reconciling medium by which the Gentile world should be brought under the influence of the Jewish religion. This could only be effected in the first place by a compromise between Monotheism and Heathenism. That compromise is Christianity; the marvellous success of which justifies its form as a provisional dispensation, and has opened the way for the future which remains yet to be disclosed.

Before we criticise this theory of our author, we will briefly indicate his remaining works.

général. En même temps, comme figure visible, Jésus Christ a laissé bien loin derrière lui toutes les figures, tous les symboles, qui avaient exprimé jusqu'alors la jonction, la fusion entre la terre et le ciel, entre la nature humaine et la nature divine.' (*Paris, Rome, Jérusalem*, vol. i. p. 436.)

3. The 'Domination Romaine' is, in some respects, the best and most valuable of them all; being in its nature almost wholly historical, and presenting a vigorous and picturesque account of the struggles of Jewish nationality against the Roman power; to which, partly from Christian prejudices, partly from the unfair colouring imparted by the traitor Josephus, justice has never yet been rendered; though the heroism and pure patriotism then displayed was at least equal to that which all admire in the case of the Maccabees. The history is carried on to the final destruction of Jewish nationality by Hadrian, after the defeat of the warrior-prophet Barcochebas; and embraces also the final development (in the school of Rabbi Akiba) of the Mishna, the coordinate form with Christianity of the now bifurcated Jewish stem—a form which Salvador allows to be in some respects inferior to its rival, and equally needing revision, but which yet, by clinging determinedly and uncompromisingly to its great fundamental principles, is destined to evolve at length the religion by which all mankind shall be embraced.

4. Lastly comes the work recently published, 'Paris, Rome, et Jérusalem,' in which the author traces what he believes to be the verdict of history, or rather of the world's experience, in regard to all the religions which emanate from the Scriptural stock; and points to the future which awaits us. All the forms of belief still extant or still lingering in the civilised world have been tried and found wanting; and a new and more comprehensive system of faith must be evolved out of the original elements of revelation. The Christian religion, under its threefold form of Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and Protestant—the Mahomedan, serviceable as it also has been in reclaiming the wild heathen of the East—and lastly, the Jewish religion itself, in its actual development by prophets and by Rabbis—though all have a large and preponderating proportion of truth, had also from the beginning an element of falsehood or weakness; and now it is abundantly manifest that they cannot much longer be maintained. The French Revolution, which sounded the death-knell of the Middle Ages and of the political order which has come down thence, is the beginning of a new era, which, according to the indissoluble connexion between politics and religion, must result in a religious revolution also. Of this creed of the future the Jewish nation is to be the expositor and the guardian—that ancient and sacred nation, confessor and martyr, whose motto through centuries of scorn and persecution has been 'I wait.' Long and terrible has been its probation,—relieved, however, by some consoling and reassuring rays breaking from age to age through the darkness that surrounded it.

First, there was the rise of Mahomedanism, checking and in part undoing the work of its great oppressor the Christian Church. Then the schism between East and West. Then the Reformation. And now, at last, the nineteenth century has opened a new vista, educed from the convulsions of the French Revolution, and proclaiming itself the beginning of the end. To this ancient stock, the depositor of primeval truth, all the nations of the earth will turn; and Jerusalem will at last become the Holy City of the world, the religious centre of all nations. Already the importance of the Holy Land is forced upon the attention of all. Already the Eastern question is assuming a gravity which will presently outweigh all else. The land and the city, which form the natural meeting-place of Asia and of Europe, will reclaim the dignity predicted by the prophets; and all mankind, recognising the truths which each are partially possessed of, and which all must yet contribute to consolidate, will find its sanctuary in Sion, its spiritual guide in Moses.

What this eclectic religion is to be, M. Salvador does not altogether explain; indeed, we suppose, he would disclaim the ability to do so. In what he does propound we see little else but a dreary and negative Deism, far inferior to the spiritualised Judaism of the Reformed German Synagogue. Indeed, in his anticipatory sketch of political and social regeneration and of doctrinal compromise, we are at a loss to discern anything which could properly be called religion at all. It would be easy to hold up to ridicule his high-wrought, and (as it seems to us) baseless visions, which could only find place in the brain of one who is at once a Jew and a Frenchman. To a Frenchman who is not a Jew, this enthusiastic laudation of Mosaic ordinances, as suggesting or anticipating all that the most enlightened philosophy can devise, must appear simply infatuation; —to a Jew who is not a Frenchman, this attuning of the loftiest prophecies of Isaiah to the strain of ‘*Partant pour la Syrie*,’ this harbingering of returning Israel with *Chasseurs de Vincennes* and the navigators of *M. de Lesseps*, must appear as profane as it is grotesque. But tempted as we might be to put aside with a smile a book which contains such extravagancies, and others which appear to us more outrageous still, we cannot and do not refuse to recognise in it much that is the genuine produce of a thoughtful and earnest mind. A work which has received the respectful consideration of critics so eminent yet so dissimilar as M. Rénan, M. Sylvestre de Sacy, and M. Secrétan, cannot be undeserving of serious notice; and it gains additional importance as indicating in a definite form the expect-

tations which are vaguely prevailing among the more thoughtful Jews.

Is there *any* ground for such expectations? we may fairly ask; is there any likelihood of a recurrence of that which earlier ages have witnessed, a new outpouring of Jewish influences upon the European mind? The phenomena are in some respects the same; an indulgent spirit of tolerance on one side, of consequent relaxation on the other; and both in a far greater measure than has ever before been witnessed. Will the result be, as on former occasions, a reaction upon the mind of Christendom?

In returning a negative to this question, and giving our reasons for doing so, we intend to keep altogether out of sight any expectations founded on prophecy; and while conscious that our own convictions rest mainly upon Christian foundations, we shall deal wholly with such considerations as would commend themselves to those of another creed as well as to ourselves.

First, then, let it be observed, that on former occasions, when Jewish influences have been felt, it has not been on account of any remarkable manifestation of original genius, or peculiar faculties possessed by the Hebrew race, but simply by the unlocking of stores of knowledge, restricted till that time to themselves. It was first as the only worshippers of the one God, and afterwards as possessors of traditional lore, inaccessible to others — it was as inheritors of a superior culture, and masters of divers languages — and besides this, as travellers, cosmopolitans, denizens of every land — that the Jews rendered such services to antiquity and to our forefathers in the Middle Ages. In all these points their superiority is gone. There is absolutely nothing left in this respect in which they have an advantage over Christians. They may take their place, indeed, by the side of others, as students and labourers in every field of knowledge; but they have nothing to impart peculiar to themselves, and it is a mere groundless fancy to suppose that they have capacities in any branch of learning superior to their neighbours.

But in religion, which is the chief point under debate, may they not again exercise a notable reaction upon Christianity? We point out, in reply, that, so far as the creed of Christendom is in a state of flux and reformation at all, the tendency is most unequivocally towards a rejection or material modification of the Jewish element which has hitherto clung to it. M. Salvador indeed observes, as one of the characteristics of Protestantism, and one from which he augurs hopefully in the interest of Judaism, that, unlike the Roman Catholic Church, it judges 'Jesus Christ,' — judges Him, that is, from a Jewish standing-

point, and with the tests of the Jewish Scriptures—assuming these to have a kind of antecedent authority. We do not deny that there is much truth in this remark. But what if the Protestant Church is finding out its mistake in this matter? what if it is learning to base its faith, with greater consistency, on grounds wholly independent of Jewish ideas—receiving and revering the Jewish Scriptures for the sake of Christ, not Christianity for the sake of Judaism?—returning to the principles upon which St. Paul based the Gentile Churches of his foundation, and from which from very early times they have too far departed? This is obviously the case in the Protestant Church, both at home and abroad, so far as there is any forward movement in it at all. Criticism is anxiously occupied with the Old Testament, and is warning us to correct the popular notions of its plenary and verbal authority. M. Salvador is well aware himself how much may be said concerning the composite nature, and the uncertain date and authorship, even of the Pentateuch; and, strangely enough, he does not shrink from the result. Or rather, let us say (for we are quite prepared to find in him all candour and openness to argument), strangely enough, while fully aware of this, he yet presses the predominant claims of the Pentateuch to a special and exceptional reverence. Here it is that his theory seems to us to fall to pieces, through its fundamental and self-betraying weakness. Meanwhile, there is no doubt about the process which is going on. Under the scrutiny of criticism, the Old Testament is assuming a changed, and (as we doubt not it will finally prove) a truer and more profitable aspect. We are not only correcting its bearings on Christianity, but attaining to a better knowledge of its real meaning, and of the spirit, circumstances, and intentions of its human authors. In this work, Jewish scholars may assuredly bear, and ought to bear, a most important part, coming to it doubtless with prejudices of their own, yet with prejudices different from and corrective of ours. M. Salvador himself has done little in this way, even in his ‘Institutions of Moses;’ though his exposition and analysis of the Song of Solomon, introduced into that work, is worthy of some attention. But others are already doing good service; and much more may be expected from Germany, when the Jews of that country shall turn the fine powers which are at present lavished upon their mediæval literature to the explanation and illustration of the Scriptures. Meanwhile we are glad to notice our own adopted countryman, Dr. Kalisch, whose commentaries on the Pentateuch are still in the course of publication, Genesis and

Exodus having already appeared. Dr. Kalisch unites a large portion of the good sense and wide information of the Englishman with the learning and critical endowments of the Germans; and though much too diffuse and digressive, in our judgment, and obviously too anxious to draw moral and spiritual lessons out of the ancient Scriptures, which can only be found there (we are persuaded) under the light reflected from Christianity, is furnishing us with a commentary of peculiar value, as candid and independent in its search for truth as it is laborious and careful.

We have already pointed out that the tendencies of the Protestant Churches, where any movement is showing itself, are not towards Judaism, but the very reverse. Even the rationalist religionists of the day recognise at least in the person and character of Christ the highest form in which the relation of man to his fellows, or to his Creator, has ever been set forth. We could not select a better expositor of this form of religious belief than M. Rénan, nor one who by his own special studies and tastes would be more inclined to follow Hebrew forms of thought; yet M. Rénan has emphatically pronounced M. Salvador's anticipations to be baseless, and given in his own allegiance to the ethical supremacy of Christianity.

And here we may offer one remark on M. Salvador's theory of the rise and origin of the Christian faith. He regards it as a joint product of Jewish ideas and Eastern mystic philosophy — a compromise (as he often calls it) between Mosaism and Polytheism — a *resultant* (as he elsewhere says) of the forces acting *ab extra* on the Jewish Church, combined with the motion originally impressed upon it; while in respect of its moral doctrines, he asserts that there is nothing prescribed by Christianity which may not be found in Jewish writings of an earlier date. Without appealing to higher arguments, we think it a sufficient answer to this theory to ask how it can be that a product of heterogeneous and discordant elements should be itself so simple and self-consistent — how a compromise should prove so uncompromising — how the resultant of uncertain and intermittent forces should be so definite, so firm, so unwavering? And as to the partial anticipations of Christian morals, which can be pointed out in the Apocrypha, in Philo, and in the Mishna (and which can be matched, let us add, by portions of Plato and other heathen philosophers), what are these but witnesses to the universal and permanent authority of that system which alone has succeeded in combining these elements, and alone has kept them pure? It is surely more than all else the mark of completed truth, to embody and assimilate all fragmentary

truth — to give it a consistency and an application which it never had before, to supply the connexion and sustaining motives which alone can fuse it into one, and bring it practically within our reach. This Christianity has done; and herein, on intellectual grounds, resides its chief claim to be recognised as divine. We could wish for no better test of the real value of the New Testament, than a comparison of it with the *Mischna*, accepting M. Salvador's definition of the two, as the rival branches of the bifurcated Jewish stem. We have no fears as to which must be pronounced the living shoot, developed from the hidden life within, and nurtured by the influences of heaven.

But certain as we regard these conclusions respecting the Christian religion, we are not equally confident in the matter of Christian *theology*. Theology, or systematised doctrine, is a thing necessarily variable, demanding or admitting variations according to the knowledge and capacity of men. It would be presumptuous in any age to think that it has elaborated the perfect or ultimate form in which religious truth is to be conceived. It is cowardly in any age to abdicate its judgment in favour of any former age, however venerable and worthy of respect. We do not deny that Christian theology may require some modifications now; and it may be that Jewish protests and Jewish criticism may do good service in the course of such modification — may help to detect notions and forms of thought which have crept in unawares from surrounding heathen influences, in the very first ages of the Church.

We have touched but lightly on M. Salvador's review of those elements of weakness and decay which he thinks he perceives in all existing forms of religion. His observations on the Roman Catholic and on the Eastern Church, on Mahomedanism, and on Rabbinical Judaism itself, would doubtless be endorsed for the most part by all Protestant readers. Similarly those on Protestantism would in all probability be pronounced most just by Dr. Döllinger; and though these are the slightest in themselves, and the least proceeding from personal knowledge, they are yet well worthy of our attention. We have already shown that one defect in the Protestant system, giving an advantage to Judaism in assailing it, is in the course of amendment. The remaining charges amount substantially to this; that Protestantism fixes its eyes on, and directs its efforts exclusively to, a reproduction or perpetuation of a past era, the primitive ages of the Church — forgetting that 'God is inexhaustible;' and that by its professed self-restriction to the ideas of the Apostolic Church, it not only limits itself in spiritual things, but dissociates itself from the characteristic tendency of the present century towards

political, social, and material progress. We think that there is great truth in these observations; and though by a happy inconsistency the Protestant Church does not so dissociate itself practically from the spirit of progress, yet the existing forms of theology tend in some respects both to impede the clergy and to alienate the sympathies of the laity from them in all departments of active life. A larger and more genial view of social duty, and of the prospects of humanity upon earth, is needed by Protestantism, and (we rejoice to add) is undoubtedly growing. And though such a change may exact some modification of prevailing dogmas, and still more a freer adherence to dogmas altogether, yet happily there is no antagonism between this more genial spirit and the true teaching of Christianity. It will be necessary, indeed, to grant that the ideas and aims of the Apostolic Church were themselves in some degree temporary and provisional, adapted to the circumstances of an infant and aggressive community; but there is no opposition between the hopeful enterprise which seeks to subdue the earth and develop to the utmost all the temporal gifts of God, and that awful yet loving Voice, which, if it addresses itself primarily to the suffering and the heavy-laden, and probes in all men the secret depths of conscience, supplies also the truest bond of brotherhood between man and man, and only depreciates the blessings of the present life in so far as they obscure or obstruct the infinitely greater ones of another.

In some further respects, also, we believe that M. Salvador is a true prophet, though we do not see that Judaism has much share in the prospects he unfolds. He notes the cordial alliances which have taken place between powers and governments of different religious creeds, Roman Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, and even Mahomedan and Heathen—alliances not only directed to selfish and dynastic ends, but for moral objects recognized and pursued in common. And he justly observes how great a witness is hereby borne to the possibility and necessity of a union in principle, superior to and independent of denominational differences. We cordially assent to this conclusion. We hail with him the opening of an era in which peoples and governments shall recognise in common the eternal obligation of truth, justice, humanity, and mutual good will, irrespective of any differences of faith, however important. And we hail the inauguration, at the same time, of an era in which all governments shall deal also with their own subjects irrespectively of religious differences; in which laws shall be based avowedly as well as practically upon the axiomatic grounds of reason and conscience; in which such dicta as that of the English constitu-

tion that 'Christianity is part of the law of the land' shall be the expression of a just confidence that whatever sound reason demands and public welfare suggests, assuredly is and must be coincident with the precepts of a religion which comes from God. But in all this we see little of the influence of Judaism, still less of the prospects of a return to a universal Mosaic religion. Rather we are convinced that the process of which the French Jews now exhibit so remarkable a phase, is part of a movement towards a state of things of which Christianity must always be the presiding and controlling head; and that the more the Jews are admitted, as in France, to a complete equality with their fellow-citizens, social as well as political, the more will the obstacles which hinder this process disappear, and Judaism as well as Rabbinism tend to become a thing of the past, absorbed in the more comprehensive religion of the future.

ART. VII.—*Les Misérables*. Par VICTOR HUGO. Ten volumes 8vo. Bruxelles: 1862.

'THIS book is a drama of which the first personage is The 'Infinite; Man is the second.' It would be difficult for any criticism, however concise, to give, in as few words, so just an idea of M. Victor Hugo's style and pretensions as this brief quotation from '*Les Misérables*' conveys. Innumerable sentences of the same nature scattered over the work, and the acquiescence in them, generally, of the critical press of France, are well calculated, it will be admitted, to awaken some diffidence in a reviewer about to grapple with four thousand pages of heterogeneous and unconnected matter. Have we been mistaken? Can this series of improbable adventures, this incongruous collection of rambling disquisitions and contradictory amplifications, be the great prose epic of the nineteenth century, as it has been proclaimed to satiety on the other side of the Channel? Is our intellect so obscured that we should have mistaken for the misshapen and monstrous phantasmagory of a political showman, the effulgent mirror of Truth held up by the hand of Genius to reflect the social deformities of the age? Is it possible that a work, which our sober judgment obliges us—notwithstanding the indisputable power and beauty of many passages—to condemn, on moral grounds, as a gross and unscrupulous appeal to popularity, and in a literary point of view as the receptacle of every gaudy piece of rhetoric and paradox which during a long course of authorship may have remained on hand;—is it possible, we say, that such a work should have

been admitted by conscientious judges to be a faithful record of 'progress from evil to good, from injustice to justice, from falsehood to truth, from darkness to light, from lust to conscience, from rottenness to life, from bestiality to duty, from Hell to Heaven, from nothingness to God'? For this second pompous definition we are again indebted to M. Victor Hugo himself; and it is not one of the least curious features of our task that when seeking to exemplify the excessive praise which has been bestowed on this work, we should unconsciously be tempted to have recourse to the author's own estimate of it. Or is it, after all, merely a 'sensation novel' of great pretensions, in which taste, nature, and truth are sacrificed in every page to the desire of exciting violent emotions of sympathy, perplexity, aversion, and disgust?

If the value of a book were to be measured by the curiosity it has excited, by the number of its readers, or even by the eulogies which hail its first appearance, we might indeed feel misgivings, for we have failed to discern the justification of these pæans in '*Les Misérables*;' as it is, we think it may not be impossible to furnish an explanation—quite independent of their intrinsic merits—of the success which has attended these ten volumes of mingled romance and declamation.

Habent sua fata libelli—Books have their destinies, and their fate, like that of men, is greatly influenced by the circumstances of birth. Their horoscopes may often be accurately cast at their nativity. In the case of '*Les Misérables*' the conjunction of the stars was peculiarly favourable. Not only must due allowance be made for the just celebrity of the author—which with the many would go far to outweigh the conclusions of their own judgment—it must also be borne in mind that the halo of exile still lingers around him. Even now, he persists, not without reason, in self-imposed banishment rather than trust the dubious sincerity of an Imperial amnesty. His name is associated with the bold, though often injudicious, defence of many a good cause, and with the vehement denunciation of political and social wrongs. As a man of letters, he will be remembered as the valiant champion of romanticism against classical routine. Victor Hugo—second only to Lamartine in this—stands in the foremost rank of the lyrical poets of France. Moreover he is the author of '*Notre Dame de Paris*,' a novel which thirty years ago electrified the reading public of France. True it is, that among the present generation, few have read '*Notre Dame de Paris*,' and that many of those enthusiastic readers of 1832, who still talk loudly of their admiration, remember their youthful impressions rather than the book itself.

Still, it was natural that the promise of a new romance from the same pen should cause great excitement.

So far the favourable influences which presided at the birth of 'Les Misérables' were undeniably legitimate. It would scarcely be desirable that the fame and antecedent good services of a writer should not affect the verdict of public opinion, even when he misapplies his powers; and the leniency of critics on such occasions is but a just and respectful recognition of the intermittent nature of genius. But other agencies were at work of a more doubtful character. About two years ago, it began to be whispered in Paris, that M. Victor Hugo had at last completed a stupendous work which had cost him the labour of years. It was to be the crown of his literary life, the summing up, so to speak, of his genius; it was to sap the foundations of Imperialism, and shake society to its very centre. The general impression was, that the book, if not purely political, was at any rate written in a strain of virulent opposition. This notion, so well calculated to stimulate public curiosity, was confirmed -- by chance or by design -- when the title of the mysterious work began to transpire. It was most happily ambiguous. 'Les Misérables!' The words mean *the wretches* as well as *the wretched*. Of course the former signification was supposed to be the correct one. The wretches, no doubt, were those political malefactors whom the author had already denounced in his 'Châtiments,' and for whom the 'avenging hump' (*le chancre vengeur*), to use his own words, has been growing slowly but surely during the last ten years. All uncertainty was dispelled when it became known that the copyright had been purchased by a Belgian publisher. Evidently it was a seditious book on which no French house had dared to risk money. The unknown 'Misérables' acquired by anticipation the charm of forbidden fruit. The day came at last, and thousands bought, read, wondered, and scarcely knew what to think of the marvellous bishop, the improbable regicide, and the impossible convict who figure in the first two volumes. And now it might be supposed that the book would be left to its fate, and stand on its own merits. Such would have been the case in England, but they manage these things better in France. Letters from the author to his friends, and their answers, filled the daily papers, and kept alive public attention. M. Claye, the printer, wrote to say that the crowds which thronged the Rue de Seine on the eventful day of publication, could only be likened to those which, in periods of famine, press round the bakers' shops; and the picture of those famishing thousands of course awakened hunger in many who, otherwise,

might have felt no cravings. By the suffrages of partial, if not venal critics, the novel of 'Les Misérables' was proclaimed to be an 'epic,' an 'epopee;' it was 'the vertiginous abyss of 'social misery, fathomed by the unerring hand of genius;' it was a 'colossal drama, animated by the breath of an august 'sympathy;' it was *the* book of the nineteenth century!

The public was confinned in its admiration, and the success of 'Les Misérables' has been complete. Parisian workmen club together in their *at'h's* to purchase a copy of this mendacious appeal to the working classes, and assemble at night to hear it read aloud. Parish priests in remote villages borrow the book from the neighbouring château, and gloat over the history of social iniquity in their lonely parsonages. All France at the present moment is imbibing the doctrine that if men steal and murder, and if women fall into the lowest depths of infamy, it is no fault of theirs: the sin lies at the door of that collective abstract being called Society. The accusation not only results from the whole book, but M. Victor Hugo expresses it in explicit terms. In his preface he says, that books such as 'Les Misérables' will be useful so long as, 'in consequence of 'our laws and our customs, there shall exist a social damnation 'creating artificial hells in the midst of civilisation;' and again, still more authoritatively elsewhere, after describing the gradual degradation of his hero, Jean Valjean: 'It is right that Society 'should look at these things, for it is Society that causes them 'to be.' It will be worth our while to examine presently how far the facts upon which he has based his story substantiate this charge.

The discrepancies and contradictions which abound in the tale of 'Les Misérables' are venial faults in comparison with the invention or even the inflation of social wrongs, when they are made the ground-work of a specious accusation. That the penal code, even of the most civilised nations of Europe, retains some vestiges of barbarism; that the production and distribution of wealth is regulated by imperfect laws; and that society, in spite of daily reforms and indefatigable exertions, has still its outcasts who are not always its worst criminals, none will venture to deny. But M. Hugo seems to forget that there may be such a thing as bearing false witness even against the guilty. The most obvious and not the least unfortunate result of such a course is to damage irrecoverably the true testimony which may be mixed up with so much baseless crimination. That these distortions or exaggerations were necessary to heighten the interest of the narrative is not an available excuse in this instance, as it might be

in the case of an ordinary novel. It is no fault of ours if M. Victor Hugo, by his pretensions, has made himself amenable to two tribunals. Neither can absolve him. As a social philosopher, he stands convicted of having pressed into the service of his cause incidents and characters which could only be tolerated in the wildest work of fiction. As a novelist, every literary judge must condemn him for having degraded his pen into a mere instrument of party warfare; for having defiled his pages with indecent pleasantries, and burdened them with ponderous pedantry; for having placed on the brow of his Muse—the Muse of the ‘*Orientales*’ and ‘*Hernani*’—the red cockade of the Socialist demagogue, and compelled her to gather up in her once brilliant robes the unclean sweepings of Parisian corruption. Who, in the coarse jester and the unscrupulous partisan of ‘*Les Misérables*,’ would recognise the author of the fanciful but elevating theory, of ‘*Art for its own Sake*’ (*L’Art pour l’Art*)?

The story, although not easily told, is by no means so long as the sight of ten octavo volumes would lead one to suppose. It is interrupted by digressions of such length, that were they struck out, and the book divested of all its superfluous white paper, ‘*Les Misérables*’ would scarcely be more substantial than the customary three-volumed English novel of the present day. One hundred and fifty pages on the battle of Waterloo have no other connexion with the main plot than the introduction of an obscure plunderer of the slain, one of those vultures in human shape which hover over all battle-fields. More than a hundred pages on monastic institutions, and as many on the sewers of Paris, are introduced with as little reason; and the history of the barricades of 1832, magnified into an epic, would form a volume in itself. If to these are added an elaborate portrait of Louis-Philippe, a dissertation on the slang language of French thieves, a glorification in sixty pages of the Parisian *gamin*, and a few other disquisitions dragged in under the most trifling pretexts, we shall be within the mark in saying that ‘*Les Misérables*’ contain about a thousand pages of totally irrelevant matter.

The first volume begins with fourteen episodical chapters devoted to the most minute description of the virtues, witty sayings, domestic arrangements, and furniture of M. Charles-François-Bienvenu Myriel, Bishop of D—, affectionately designated by the grateful poor of his diocese as Monseigneur Bienvenu.* This personage, who seems to us—if we may

* The original of this portrait is supposed to be Monseigneur

venture to use such an expression—the very caricature of Christian charity, plays a prominent part in the conversion of the convict hero, Jean Valjean, and has in general been much admired. We may therefore be excused for devoting some space to him, although he disappears about the middle of the first volume, and is never heard of again. There are, indeed, but three characters in the whole work really deserving of careful analysis: the Bishop, Jean Valjean the hero, and the Inspector of Police, Javert,—the saint, the convict, and the thief-catcher. These have evidently been studiously worked up by M. Victor Hugo, and are the embodiment of certain principles. Fantine, Marius, and Cosette, although they give their names to three of the parts into which '*Les Misérables*' are divided, are mere lay-figures adorned at times with that splendid drapery which M. Hugo knows so well how to throw over his most unnatural conceptions, but more frequently decked out with tawdry finery. Neither our limits nor the plan we have in view will admit of our following all the personages of the drama from beginning to end. In Jean Valjean the convict's history—in his condemnation, conversion, and subsequent struggles, in his relations to the Bishop who represents absolute goodness, and to the law of his country which represents unmitigated severity, lie the pith and marrow of the book. We shall therefore strive, in spite of many tempting digressions, to keep a fast hold of the one thread which runs through the ten volumes, and we shall confine ourselves to examining Jean Valjean's merits as the hero of a novel, and his qualifications as a victim of social injustice.

Monsieur Myriel lived in the episcopal town of D——, but not in the episcopal residence. He had exchanged it for the hospital, which was a small low building with a little garden, and had put the sick in possession of the spacious and lofty rooms of the palace. His household consisted of his maiden sister Mademoiselle Baptistine, and his old servant Madame Magloire. The two women form a pretty picture in their respect and submission to the Bishop, whose word, however

Miollis, bishop of Digne, brother of that general Miollis who took Pius VII. prisoner and was governor of Rome for many years. M. Hugo says on this subject:—'*Nous ne prétendons pas que le portrait que nous faisons ici soit vraisemblable, nous nous bornons à dire qu'il est ressemblant.*' This is not sufficient: in a work of fiction the laws of literary composition require verisimilitude rather than absolute truth—likelihood, not likeness. The neglect of this rule is one of the most marked characteristics of the modern school of '*realism*' in France.

gently spoken, is to them law. Their life is one of great privation; for Monseigneur Bienvenu, not content with giving up his house, has also relinquished the revenues of the diocese in favour of the poor. He has reserved for the maintenance of the two old women and himself only sixty pounds a year. Upon this income they manage to keep two cows, although they possess no other land than their garden, which measures a quarter of an acre. This piece of housekeeping is the more wonderful, as the surplus milk is not sold, but given to the hospital! Such a trifle may seem too insignificant for criticism; but it becomes worthy of notice when coupled with the detailed account given of all the Bishop's domestic arrangements, and every bit of furniture, from the chair in his own bedroom, which remained propped against the wall to dissemble the want of a leg, to the arm-chair in Mademoiselle Baptistine's apartment, which was taken up through the window in consequence of being too large for the narrow staircase. Minuteness, carried to this extent, can only be excused in favour of life-like exactness; whereas M. Hugo may be said to be constantly obliging his readers to look through an inaccurate microscope. There is always something untrue in his most elaborate pictures. When we come to examine, instead of the chairs and tables, the character and conduct of the Bishop, we shall discover the same want of the first elements of probability. In living on the produce of his cows himself, and in giving the remainder to the poor, Monseigneur Bienvenu proved himself both abstemious and charitable. The only objection to be made is, that he could not have kept the cows at all.

The chief characteristic of the Bishop is goodness, a goodness which embraces all things, great and small. On one occasion, we are told, he sprained his foot to avoid crushing an ant, and on another he was observed by his sister to remain in contemplation of a hideous spider, and was overheard to mutter to himself, 'Poor thing, it is not your fault!' As regards his fellow-creatures his charity was insatiable. 'He visited the poor while his money lasted, and when it was spent he visited the rich.' It is the compelling and all-sufficing power of this ardent charity that the author has sought to prove. Of all the divine attributes this good bishop seems to have understood one only—mercy. Towards Jean Valjean he exercises it to the exclusion, not only of justice, but even of common sense. But before bringing together his very good and his very bad hero, his bishop and his convict, M. Hugo exemplifies, by means of a series of anecdotes, the cheerful temper and charitable wit of Monseigneur Myriel. This is done in a fashion singularly un-

graceful for a writer of so much ability and experience. No editor of an 'Ana' could have strung together a collection of good sayings with less literary skill. We pass these stories over with the less regret that some of them are far from new. Four several expeditions of the Bishop's are afterwards recounted to exhibit his more essential qualities. We will venture to say that on each of these occasions he fails in his duty as a Christian prelate.

The first story serves to introduce M. Hugo's favourite thesis, the abolition of the penalty of death. In the town of D—— a man is to be executed, a poor clown who exhibited himself at fairs. The parish priest refuses to attend him to the scaffold. 'It is no concern of mine. What have I to do with that mountebank? My place is not there.' When this speech is reported to the Bishop, he merely says, 'Monsieur le curé is right: it is not his place to go, it is mine.' Upon which he attends, in his episcopal robes, the wretched man to the scaffold; and M. Hugo seizes the opportunity of inserting a few pages on the guillotine. 'All the social questions ranged around that axe upraise their notes of interrogation.' Were the digression far more eloquent than it is, it would scarcely justify the invention of a priest so destitute of decency as to refuse his spiritual assistance in the terms we have transcribed. But what shall we say of the Bishop who, instead of inflicting ecclesiastical censure on his unworthy subordinate, merely says, 'Monsieur le curé is right'? We would fain hope that the clergy of France could not furnish two such specimens of ignorance of all priestly duties as M. Hugo has imagined.

Example number two of the Bishop's excellence is soon told, but is not the less curious. A robber named Cravatte had broken into the cathedral of Embrun, and carried away the church ornaments and episcopal vestments. About the same time the Bishop was making a tour in the mountain districts of his diocese. Cravatte, by way of doing homage to his pastoral virtues, sends him the spoil taken from the cathedral, with this inscription: 'Cravatte to Monseigneur Bienvenu.' Thanks to this opportune restitution the Bishop officiates with full episcopal splendour in the mountain villages; and then, in obedience to the dictates of his overruling charity, returns the property of the chapter of Embrun to . . . the hospital of D——! M. Hugo says, 'a note was found in his papers relating most probably to this business, and which ran thus: It is a question whether the things should revert to the cathedral or to the hospital.' A question scarcely presenting a doubt, we should

say, to any mind in which moral perception was not completely obscured by sentimentalism.

The third story exhibits the author's toleration. A senator (the scene took place under the first Empire), a clever man, 'and sufficiently lettered to think himself a disciple of Epicurus, 'when he was merely a product of Pigault-Lebrun,' invites Monseigneur Myriel to dinner, and undertakes *inter pocula* to explain to him his system of philosophy. The following is a sample of the professions in which he indulges on the strength of a senator and a bishop being 'two augurs' who must needs wink and smile at each other when they meet:—

'I hate Diderot; he was an idealogist, a declaimer, and a revolutionist, a believer at heart and a greater bigot than Voltaire. Voltaire was wrong to ridicule Needham—for Needham's eels proved that God was unnecessary. A drop of vinegar in a spoonful of paste stood instead of your *fiat lux*. Suppose the drop to be bigger and the spoon larger—there you have the world. Man is the eel. What then is the use of the Creator? My Lord Bishop, I am sick of the Jehovah hypothesis. It serves only to beget starveling day-dreamers. I say, down with that great *All* which bothers me, and long live *Zero* which leaves me quiet.' . . . 'My Lord Bishop, the immortality of the soul is a mere I-wish-you-may-get-it (*un écoute-s'il-pleut*). Is it not Tertullian that says that the blessed will go from one star to another? So be 'it. We shall be the grass-hoppers of the heavens. And then we are to see God. Ta-ta-ta. A fig for all these paradises. God is a monster humbug. I would not publish all this in the "Moniteur," but I whisper it to my friends.' . . . 'After all though, those who are at the foot of the ladder, the pennyless, out-of-elbow poor devils, must have something. So you cram them with legends, chimeras, the soul, immortality, paradise, and the stars. They swallow it all. They spread it on their dry bread.' . . .

To four pages of this atrocious blasphemy and impertinence the Bishop replies briefly and good-humouredly. Monseigneur Myriel must, we think, have been singularly fond of dining out, and have had a great idea of the toleration imposed by social intercourse, to have continued on good terms with his friend the Senator after such a display. The whole anecdote is simply absurd.

It is, however, thrown into shade by another scene which has been pronounced, even by English critics who might have been supposed to be good judges of what conservative bishops ought to be, a triumph of dramatic power. We are not allowing undue place to Monseigneur Myriel. He is the very cornerstone of M. Hugo's social philosophy, at least if we understand it rightly. He is not introduced, as might be sup-

posed, to show how very foolishly and even culpably a good man may behave who takes for his sole rule of conduct the unreasoning impulse of a pitying heart—he is presented as a model. The mere splendour of his goodness drives back the dazzled crring soul of Jean Valjean from the paths of crime. Indeed, it is implied that indiscriminate indulgence, such as his, might be substituted with advantage for the whole penal code.

But we are anticipating: for the present we must follow Monseigneur Myriel on a visit to one of his flock, an ex-member of the Convention. The old revolutionist was an object of hatred and dread to all the country round, and was dying unpitied and alone. M. Hugo takes advantage of the interview between the royalist Bishop and the Conventionnel, to put in the mouth of the latter his own political creed. The poor Bishop is completely beaten. All his accusations against the Revolution are overturned by a few words. 'A cloud had been gathering for fifteen hundred years; at the end of fifteen centuries it burst: you are calling the thunderbolt to account.' All the crimes of monarchy during centuries are triumphantly recapitulated and opposed to the horrors which terrorism crowded into the space of eighteen months: the death of the infant Louis XVII. is paired off with that of the young brother of Cartouche, and Bossuet's 'Te Deum' after the Dragonnades is pitted against Marat's applause of the guillotine. The Bishop's replies are of a peculiarly feeble description, such as authors generally place in the mouths of their self-created political opponents. He, however, makes an effort to fulfil his ministry in respect of the dying man, and speaks to him of his God. Whereupon the Conventionnel replies—but we must give his profession of faith in his own words:—

'O toi! O idéal! toi seul existes! . . . L'Infini est. Il est là. Si l'infini n'avait pas de moi, le moi serait sa borne, il ne serait pas infini; en d'autres termes, il ne serait pas. Or, il est. Donc il a un moi. Ce moi de l'infini, c'est Dieu!'

This definition of his belief appears so completely satisfactory, that when after recapitulating the good deeds of his long life, and the services rendered by him to his country and to mankind, he concludes by asking Monseigneur Myriel what he has come to seek: 'Your blessing,' replies the awe-struck Bishop, falling on his knees! When we consider that the mission of the Catholic priest is to confess and to absolve the penitent,—that he is in his own eyes the representative of God on earth, with power to loose or to bind in heaven as well as here below,—it is difficult to conceive anything more unnatural than such conduct. Beside the death-bed of a saint a priest

would not have humbled himself thus. The sense of his individual unworthiness should have been completely merged in the dignity of his office. That the scene is both effective and dramatic there can be no doubt. But dramatic effects are dearly purchased at the expense of all artistic truth and common sense.

M. Hugo has naturally supposed that some readers might be curious to know what were the tenets of this peculiar bishop, and has devoted two chapters to the subject under the following titles: 'What he thought,' and 'What he believed.' We are afraid that Monseigneur Myriel was not very orthodox. However, 'he believed as much as he could,' says M. Hugo. But the conscience of so good a man might be taken upon trust. ('La conscience du juste doit être crue sur parole.') *Credo in Patrem* would he often exclaim—an implied limitation in his belief which seems scarcely consistent with his episcopal dignity. 'He did not go quite the length of a Brahmin,' but very nearly, in his pity for animals. He was not, however, the pantheistical priest of modern French romance, we are expressly told. He did not attempt to scale the altitudes from which a 'Swedenborg or a Pascal lapsed into madness.' He appears, in fact, to have discarded, as needlessly perplexing, many questions which we had hitherto considered as peculiarly suitable for the meditation of ecclesiastical dignitaries; upon which, indeed, we supposed that men thought it necessary to make up their minds before they consented to become bishops. He was all pity. 'If some people found fault with him, it was 'on account of his excess of love—*quia multum amavit*.'

Such is the man who, armed with the single virtue of loving-kindness, does battle in M. Victor Hugo's pages with one of the most intricate social problems of the age. Whether any system can be based on the success which attends his encounter with Jean Valjean, our readers will judge.

One October evening in the year 1815, as Monseigneur Myriel was going to sit down to supper with his sister, Mademoiselle Baptistine, Madame Magloire attempted, for the hundredth time, to open his eyes to the danger of keeping his door constantly on the latch, by night and by day. A suspicious-looking man had been seen skulking about—he had been refused admittance at all the inns of the town, and prudent people, she said, should keep their doors closed instead of saying, Come in! to everybody, as Monseigneur always did.

'At this instant some one knocked loudly at the door.

' "Come in," said the bishop.

' The door opened. It was pushed quickly, and thrown wide

open as by the thrust of a violent and resolute hand. A man entered. . . . He took a few steps and then stopped, leaving the door open behind him. He had his knapsack at his back and his stick in his hand. There was a bold, violent, and yet wearied expression in his eye. The light of the fire shone upon his face: he was hideous. . . . The bishop looked at him steadily and calmly. As he was about to speak and ask the new comer what he wanted, the man, leaning both his hands on his stick, and looking alternately at the bishop and at the two women, said, in a loud voice:—"I say, my name is Jean Valjean. I am a convict. I have been nineteen years at the galleys. I was liberated four days ago, and am bound to Pontarlier. I have been walking these four days, since I left Toulon. To-day, I've walked twelve leagues. To-night, when I reached this place, I went to an inn, and they drove me away on account of my yellow passport I had shown at the *mairie*: I had been obliged to show it. I went to another inn; there they told me to get out. From one to another—nobody would receive me. I went to the jail, the turnkey would not let me in. I went to a dog's kennel, the dog bit me and drove me away as though he had been a man. Maybe he knew who I was. I went out in the fields to sleep. There were no stars. I thought it was going to rain, and that there was no God in heaven to keep away the rain, and so I came back into the town to get under a doorway. As I was going to lie down on the stones, I met an old woman who showed me your house, and said—knock there. Here I am. What's this place? Are you an inn? I have money—my savings. One hundred and nine francs fifteen sous, I've earned at the galleys by working nineteen years. I'll pay. What do I care? I've money. I'm very tired. Twelve leagues on foot. I am very hungry. May I stop here?"

"Madame Magloire," said the bishop, "lay another cover."

"The man came forward into the room, and stood near the lamp which was on the table. "You see," said he, as if he had not rightly understood, "you see, that's not it. Did you hear what I said? I've been at the galleys—a convict. I come from Toulon." He drew from his pocket and unfolded a sheet of yellow paper. "Here's my passport, yellow, you see. That serves to get me driven away from everywhere. Will you read? I know how to read. I learnt at the galleys. There's a school for those who choose. See what they have put on the passport: Jean Valjean, liberated convict, native of . . . you don't care . . . been nineteen years at the galleys . . . five years for burglary, fourteen years for having attempted to escape four times—a very dangerous character! There! Everybody has driven me out. Will you receive me? Is this an inn? Will you give me food and lodging? Have you got a stable?"

"Madame Magloire," said the bishop, "put clean sheets on the bed in the alcove."

Jean Valjean the liberated convict sits down to supper with this good man and his sister, is treated like an honoured guest, invariably addressed as *Monsieur* to his infinite satisfaction,

and entertained with cheerful conversation in which not a word of curiosity or exhortation finds place. Finally, he is conducted by the Bishop himself to the only spare bed in the house, situated in an inner room, communicating with that of the master of the house by a door without either bolt or key. Christian charity and even foolish confidence could go no further, but a novelist like M. Hugo, in quest of dramatic effect, knows no bounds. This absurd old bishop must needs insist on having out his silver candlesticks and displaying all his spare plate (a few spoons and forks), on the table at which Jean Valjean is seated at supper with him, for no other purpose, that we can conceive, than to throw temptation in his way. Valjean himself seems to have had a clear perception of the real state of the case, for when the Bishop, after lighting him to his room wishes him a good night, he glares fiercely round at him and says in a hoarse voice: 'So then you put me to sleep close to you! Have you thought about it? How do you know that I am not a murderer?' The Bishop answers calmly: 'Cela regarde le bon Dieu!'

Who can be surprised that after a few hours' rest, Valjean, awakened by the unusual luxuriousness of his bed, should think over the silver forks and spoons of his host? He had come out of the galleys with a hundred and nine francs, the plate was old and massive and would fetch double that sum. After a long and fearful reverie, during which reason seems to be slumbering and animal instinct alone at work, he gets out of his bed, opens the window, and ascertains that escape will be easy over the low garden wall. He then steals softly into the Bishop's room, armed with a short iron crow-bar, hesitates a few seconds at the sight of the good old man's peaceful slumbers, opens the cupboard, seizes the plate, returns to his room, gets out of the window into the garden, leaps like a tiger over the wall, and disappears.

Of course M. Hugo knew the Bishop to be a very sound sleeper, or he would not have sent Jean Valjean into his bedroom; for if we suppose an unconscious movement on the part of the old man, the appearance of Mademoiselle Baptistine awakened by the creaking of the door, or a scream from Madame Magloire, what becomes of Valjean's conversion? The iron crow-bar would have speedily descended on some unoffending head, and he would have become a murderer as well as a thief. May we venture to add that, in our opinion, a few words of paternal counsel and exhortation after supper, and even a bolt between the two rooms, would have been more in place than an exhibition of spoons and forks, accompanied with

gentlemanly reserve? We are no admirers of that prying charity which thrusts its advice, unasked, upon the poor whose wants leave them defenceless against benevolent intrusions, but in this case Monseigneur Myriel might surely have been justified in considering himself a Heaven-appointed confessor to the poor wretch whom chance had thrown in his way. Valjean, deprived of all sympathy for years, would have been ready enough to tell his story. The monstrous absurdity of risking the life of two innocent women, together with his own, rather than make use of a bolt or key, requires no commentary.

We should scruple to subject the devices of a novelist to such minute criticism as this, especially when they serve to bring about a highly dramatic situation, powerfully described, were not that novelist—we can scarce repeat it too often—a teacher. The conduct of his bishop is held up for imitation, as opposed to the mistrust with which Society generally regards criminals, even after they have legally expiated their offences. Perhaps, however, Monseigneur Myriel reckoned upon seeing his guest again, as indeed he did. The next morning Jean Valjean returned, but this time he was escorted by three gendarmes. He had been found with the plate in his possession, and arrested—a most fortunate circumstance as regards the morality of the story, for it is evident that had he escaped detection, the Bishop would have lost his plate without any advantage to his brother's soul. Without an instant's hesitation, the Bishop affirms that he had made a present of the forks and spoons to Valjean on the previous night; he even goes so far as to inquire why he did not take away the silver candlesticks also, since they, too, had been given to him, and insists upon his carrying them off! Of course the prisoner is set at liberty. 'And now, my friend,' said the Bishop, when next you pay me a visit, do not enter by the garden: my street door is always on the latch, night and day.'

The gendarmes retire, and the Bishop adds: 'Remember that you have promised to employ this sum in becoming an honest man.' Valjean, who has promised nothing, is struck dumb. 'Jean Valjean, my brother, you no longer belong to evil, but to good: I have purchased your soul from you; I reclaim it from the spirit of darkness and of sin, and I give it to God.' And by these few words, according to M. Victor Hugo, was the sinful soul of Jean Valjean redeemed—but not immediately.

We need scarcely point out the want of moral sense, displayed in this instance, by the author. The ready lie of the Bishop is in itself extremely offensive, but it may be, that some people, like M. Hugo, may consider that the end justifies the

means: we will therefore let that pass. The real question is, What was the end he proposed to himself? Evidently to impede the action of justice. We are given to understand, that to prevent punishment of any kind, even for the most inexcusable offence, is a virtuous act. The law is a monster, from whose devouring jaw it is our duty to protect even our most guilty neighbour. It must be borne in mind, that the Bishop knew nothing of Valjean's previous history, which would have explained his indulgence. The man he let loose on the world might have been, for ought he knew, one of those monomaniacs of crime whom no generosity can reclaim. If Valjean, on being set at liberty, had committed some heinous offence instead of merely robbing, as we shall see, a poor child of his little earnings, we question if a certain share of moral responsibility might not, fairly, have been attributed to the good bishop.

And who was Jean Valjean? He had been a day-labourer in the village of Favrolles. He had lost his father and another when a child, and had been adopted by his sister. When he grew up, that sister having been left a widow with seven children, he had undertaken to provide for them all by his labour, but during the severe winter of 1795, when bread was dear and work scarce, he had found it impossible to support nine people out of his earnings. The children were starving:—one night Jean Valjean broke into a baker's shop and stole a loaf. He was caught, judged, and sentenced to five years' hard labour at the galleys. It was a case of burglary, and the law was plain, says M. Hugo. Four unsuccessful attempts at escape from his prison brought upon him an aggravation of his punishment, to the extent of fourteen years more, so that when he entered the town of D—— a liberated convict in 1815, he had been, as he said to the Bishop, upwards of nineteen years a prisoner at Toulon.

When Valjean arrived at the galleys he was an ignorant man, but not a fool. 'The natural light,' we are told, 'was still burning within him.' Misfortune added intensity to that glimmering ray, and by its aid, the convict, a self-constituted tribunal, during his long years of toil and shame, passed judgment on himself, on Society, and on Providence. M. Hugo has summed up the debates in a very able chapter, entitled 'Le dedans du désespoir.' Valjean acknowledges to himself that he has been guilty, but of course finds all the extenuating circumstances which his judges could not fail to have admitted, had they not been created by the novelist for the express purpose of condemning him. He next summons Society to his bar, and puts the question whether 'the excess of punishment

‘does not efface the fault, and reverse the relative situations — setting the sin of repression in the place of the sin of commission, turning the criminal into a victim, the debtor into a creditor, and placing right on the side of the man by whom right has been violated.’ These questions he answers affirmatively, and ‘condemns Society to his hatred.’ He comes to the conclusion that life is war, and that in that war he had been conquered. ‘He had no other weapon than his hatred; he resolved to sharpen it at the galleys, and take it away with him when he left.’ There was a school at Toulon for the convicts; at forty he learned to read, to write, and to cypher; his learning was to make his hatred more efficient. ‘After having judged Society, which had been the cause of his misery, he judged Providence by whom Society was created, and condemned it likewise.’ It will be admitted, that it was not without reason that the yellow passport designated Jean Valjean as a very dangerous character.

Here we may be excused for pausing to examine some of the features of Valjean’s case, for on that case M. Hugo has based his accusation, or, to borrow a term of French law, which alone can give an idea of the unscrupulous vehemence of his crimination — his *réquisitoire* against Society. It would have been desirable, in our opinion, if his object be really reform, that he should have confined himself to such facts as would be probable under the present law of France. The penal code now in vigour was promulgated in 1810, and, to be an appropriate example, Jean Valjean should have been condemned at some time posterior to that date. Now, even M. Hugo must admit that, with the help of the ‘extenuating circumstances’ of which modern French juries are so prodigal in cases far less interesting than that of his hero, this latter would have escaped with something less than five years’ hard labour for stealing a loaf. At the time of Valjean’s trial, the penal code of 1791 was still in force, and extenuating circumstances were as yet unknown; but even then there was a *jury-d’accusation* — proverbially lenient — whose functions resembled those of our grand juries, and which would certainly not have sent him to the Assizes.* At

* It is a curious fact that M. Hugo — who is often so minute in the most unimportant details — has mis-stated the law in respect of his hero, and that to the detriment of his own cause. In 1795, according to the letter of the law, Valjean would have been condemned to fourteen, not five, years’ hard labour. The punishment for housebreaking was eight years’ hard labour, to which two years might be added for each of the following aggravating circumstances :

no time, indeed, since the institution of juries in France, have they considered themselves bound to judge the mere fact of crime, without taking into consideration what they call '*la question d'intention*.' Lawful or unlawful, the exercise of this power would have saved Valjean. At any rate, his case, as M. Hugo puts it, is such a mere exception, that it proves nothing. We might add that, in 1795, the mob of Faverolles would most probably have hanged at the lamp-post any baker who prosecuted a poor man for stealing a loaf.

Jean Valjean's case was certainly a very hard one, but it is not easy to see what conclusion M. Hugo means to draw from it. Are we to understand that he does not consider burglary a punishable offence at all, or that he would expect the written law to distinguish between different sorts of burglary, and pronounce some to be excusable, or, at the very least, proclaim that every hungry man has a right to help himself at the baker's? We are equally at a loss to understand M. Hugo's views, when he inveighs against the law which punished Valjean's repeated attempts at escape. Does he consider all aggravation of punishment in such cases as gratuitous severity? There are few provisions of the law so really merciful as those which serve to deter convicts from seeking to elude their punishment. As regards Society, no unpunished malefactor is half so dangerous as an escaped convict, who is debarred, by that very circumstance, from any honest means of gaining a livelihood. As regards the man himself, no prison can be worse than the life of concealment and crime to which he condemns himself by flight.

There is gross exaggeration in the picture of Valjean's sufferings on leaving the galleys. No liberated convict in France has any difficulty in finding food or lodging when travelling to his appointed destination, and the town of D—— must have been peculiarly inhospitable. Of course we do not allude to the conduct of the dog, on which M. Hugo lays some stress, as we are convinced that he would have behaved in exactly the same manner to any honest man attempting to take possession of his kennel. The evil in general lies in another direction, and liberated convicts find but too many haunts open to them where they meet with former associates. On leaving the galleys they remain under the surveillance of the police, and have a place of residence assigned to them, which is purposely chosen as far

if the theft was committed by breaking into an outer wall or enclosure; if the building entered was inhabited; and lastly, if the theft took place at night.

removed as possible from the part of the country where they have lived before. The police alone is in the secret of their former lives, and we may add that the secret is generally well kept: the object being to enable them to lead honest lives, which would scarcely be possible if their antecedents were known. There are daily instances of *forçats libérés* who live and die among people who never suspected their real situation. Indeed, on the occasion of a very recent trial, when the marriage of an innocent girl with a liberated convict was declared valid, notwithstanding her ignorance of his former life, public opinion in France was greatly excited, and the excessive secrecy of the police in such matters was the subject of much angry dispute. We should have wished M. Hugo, as a social reformer, to have pointed out some better plan for disposing of liberated convicts; there is room for improvement; and the question is now of more than common interest to ourselves, for the liberated *forçat* is, in respect of police surveillance, a ticket-of-leave-man. But we have sought in vain through these volumes for a single practical suggestion.

No chapter in 'Les Misérables' shows M. Hugo in a better light as a novelist than that in which Valjean's first adventure on quitting the Bishop is related. One cannot but feel indignant with a writer who, having the power to paint such a scene as that with Petit-Gervais in a few simple words, ransacks at other times the whole vocabulary, and indeed often goes beyond it, in search of violent contrasts and laboured effect. Valjean wanders out of the town — repentance and the stubborn pride of guilt struggling for mastery in his heart. He feels humbled by the Bishop's forgiveness, and is conscious that he no longer grasps so firmly that terrible weapon he brought with him from the galleys — his hatred of mankind. He is dimly aware that the inner man which was in unison with a prison and the gendarmes is at variance with the free sky and the perfume of the wild flowers in the hedges, and above all with the remembrance of those gentle words, the first he has heard for twenty years. A little Savoyard, Petit-Gervais, 'with his dormouse at his back and his hurdy-gurdy by his side, comes singing along the narrow pathway, tossing up as he goes his money in the air, and catching it on the palm of his hand. A two-franc piece rolls on the ground as he passes before Valjean, who, with the ready instinct of crime, sets his foot upon it. The gloomy abstraction of the almost unconscious thief, and the innocent foolhardiness of the boy, claiming his money with childish menace, are admirably depicted. This is Valjean's last backsliding. When he has driven away Petit-

Gervais, scared and sobbing for the loss of his money, he remains absorbed in a fearful reverie. At last the words of the Bishop are realised: the soul is reclaimed from the powers of darkness and of sin, and Jean Valjean, starting with horror at the remembrance of his own deed, calls loudly on Petit-Gervais to return. But the boy is far away. For hours Valjean the penitent wrestled with that wretched convict who was his former self. At last the victory was gained, for in the early dawn 'a carter who was passing through the town of D---, saw a man keeling on the stones in the attitude of prayer, before the door of Monseigneur Bienvenu.'

This meeting with Petit-Gervais is not, as most readers might suppose, a mere episode, charmingly told, and introduced to show the death-struggles of ferocious instincts in a hardened criminal, it has been made by M. Hugo, in defiance of all probability, the turning-point of his story. For this insignificant theft which had no witness but a frightened child, whose testimony would scarcely find credence, Valjean is to be condemned to death at the expiration of eight years! Indeed, from this point the whole work is but a series of impossibilities, which it would be tedious to point out separately.

On leaving D---, Valjean, instead of going to his appointed place of residence, Pontarlier, goes to the town of M.-sur-M., thereby placing himself *en rupture de ban*, and subjecting himself to the chance of being sent back to the galleys, one does not exactly see why, as he has no dishonest intentions. M.-sur-M. carries on a trade in artificial jet, and Valjean introduces some improvement in the manufacture which is attended with such lucrative results that three years after leaving Toulon we find him, under the name of M. Madeleine, at the head of a large manufactory, with upwards of 25,000*l.* placed at Lafitte's, after having liberally endowed several charitable institutions. He is, moreover, mayor of the town, and universally esteemed. In fact, we are told that the name of M. Madeleine was pronounced with as much respect as that of Monseigneur Myriel. All French towns, it will be seen, are not alike, and this exaggerated good fortune at M.-sur-M. is perhaps given as a make-weight for the unaccountable treatment inflicted on Valjean at D---. If convicts can in the space of three years amass handsome fortunes, and become mayors of large towns without any inquiry being instituted as to their past lives, we do not quite understand why they should complain of Society. Jean Valjean, had he remained an honest field-labourer at Faverolles, would certainly never have succeeded half so well. That prison-school at Toulon must have

been very good to have rendered an ignorant thief, who learned his letters at forty, capable on leaving it of discharging municipal functions to public satisfaction. For if M. Madeleine, alias Jean Valjean, owed his virtues to the Bishop, he appears to have owed his talents to the galleys.

At M. Madeleine's manufactory soon appears a new personage--Fantine. In the preface of '*Les Misérables*' we are told that the book is an attempt to deal with three great problems of the age; Fantine represents one of these -- 'the degradation of woman through want.' She is first introduced to the reader as a young and thoughtless grisette, leading the life that such girls often lead with a young student of the '*Quartier Latin*.' We are, on this occasion, treated to a scene of student life in Paris, which has a strange air of unreality about it. M. Hugo has at times a very peculiar style. It consists of a mixture of aphorisms, paradoxes, pedantry and puns, chopped up into very short sentences, quite unconnected with each other. This he puts into the mouth of any of his personages, man, woman, or child, when he is minded to be funny. The students indulge in it largely. Fantine is described as a sort of Parisian Topsy, having 'grown' in the 'unfathomable depths of social darkness.' She was an orphan who had never known her parents. No one could say how she came by that curious name of Fantine. She was born at M.-sur-M., and had come up to Paris at the age of fifteen to try her luck. There she had worked in order to live, and there, we are told, 'for the same reason she had loved, for the heart too has its hunger.' As Society is to be called to account for all the misfortunes that happen to Fantine, of course no blame, however slight, is thrown on this first fault, which is nevertheless the origin of all her misfortunes.

The old story: Fantine is forsaken, and remains with a child to support. In no part of his work has M. Hugo accumulated more improbable horrors than in this episode. She turns into money all she possesses, and sets out on foot, with her child in her arms, for M.-sur-M., her native town, resolved to try and earn an honest livelihood. Of course she is represented as loving her child far more than any honest wife and mother ever loved hers. She nevertheless leaves her little Cosette at an inn by the road-side at Montfermeil with a couple named Thénardier, whom she has never seen before (and who turn out to be monsters in human shape), merely because they seem to take good care of their own children! This is the more extraordinary, as, after a hideous portrait of them, we are told that 'on hearing them say one word, or on seeing their slightest gesture,

'anyone would have guessed that their past had its dark secrets, 'and their future its gloomy mysteries.' But the keen eye of the mother does not detect what 'anyone would have guessed;' so she gives them the greater part of her little hoard, and promises regular remittances out of her earnings. At M.-sur-M. she is admitted into M. Madeleine's manufactory, and earns tolerable wages; but the Thénardiens are insatiate, and under one pretence or another, are always asking for money. At last, strange to relate, Fantine is turned out of the factory. M. Madeleine, the ex-convict, is so particular that he never sets his foot in that part of his establishment where the girls work—a rather exaggerated reaction, it would seem, against the morals of the galleys. He has confided the supervision of the female department to a matron so austere that she discharges Fantine, on hearing that she has an illegitimate child. Were we not told so, we should certainly never have guessed that M.-sur-M. was situated in France, and was one of those manufacturing towns where statistics tell us that one child out of every three is illegitimate. In obedience to that law of wrongheadedness which governs all M. Hugo's characters, Fantine, instead of appealing to M. Madeleine, whose charitable renown might well have emboldened her, sinks down, step by step, into the lowest depths of degradation. The Thénardiens press for money; Fantine sells her hair, and sends the price, ten francs. They write that Cosette is ill; she then sells her front teeth, for which a quack dentist pays twenty francs a-piece! It never occurs to her to use this dearly-earned money in going to see her child, and taking her away from people whose honesty, by this time, she must suspect. After this last hideous sacrifice, of which one would suppose only the most stubborn and unconquerable virtue to be capable, the Thénardiens threatening to turn Cosette out of doors if she does not send a hundred francs, she says, in her despair, 'Vendons le reste!'

'And then life and social order have done with her. The worst that can happen has happened. Henceforth she has nothing to avoid, nothing to fear.'

'Tombe sur elle toute la nuée, et passe sur elle tout l'océan, que lui importe? C'est une éponge imbibée!'

'What is the meaning of this story of Fantine?' says M. Hugo, in a chapter to which, according to a favourite custom of his, he gives a Latin title,—*Christus nos liberavit*. 'It is Society purchasing a slave—buying a slave from want. . . . A cruel bargain. A soul for a bit of bread—want offers and Society accepts.'

Society, it seems to us, has sinned against many others far

more than against poor Fantine. She had neither parents, nor even a name, yet some one—a member of Society, we presume—had brought her up to womanhood in health and beauty; she had been preserved from juvenile depravity, for she was a ‘*filie sage*,’ says M. Hugo on first mentioning her, and she had been taught a trade. Had that ‘hunger of the heart’ for which he is so lenient been a little more under control, she might have been a happy wife and mother, and M. Madeleine might have been better justified in telling her, as he does at last, that she has ‘never ceased to be holy and virtuous in the sight of God.’

We will not dwell on the improbability of Fantine’s not finding a single friend among all her factory companions to speak one word in her behalf. Even among the so-called respectable members of Society, bad as M. Hugo may consider them—and although they have not had the advantage of being purified by sin or crime—we venture to assert that there are very few who would not have extended a helping hand to the destitute young mother. However such things may be, therefore, strictly speaking, the novelist has a right to make them serve his ends. But, in our turn, we would inquire what is the meaning of this story? The old-fashioned moral of the importance of one false step in early life would have been very trite and tame, no doubt, but it would have been intelligible. As it is, what result does M. Hugo expect from his teaching? He prides himself upon being a popular author, and his book is in the hands of readers of both sexes and all classes in France. What lesson are the struggling and yet innocent Fantines who read ‘*Les Misérables*’ to draw from M. Madeleine’s address to her when in the hospital?

‘You have suffered much, poor mother! But do not complain, you have henceforward the portion of the elect. It is in this wise that men create angels. They are not to blame; they know not how to set about it otherwise. The hell from which you are issuing is the first form of heaven. It was necessary to begin thus.’ (*‘Il fallait commencer par là.’*)

Bad trees, it is generally supposed, are those which bring forth bad fruit; but the author of ‘*Les Misérables*’ has planted the wilderness of sin and crime with trees which produce the growth of Heaven. In our penal cells, and in the shame of our streets, is to be found the stuff of which angels are made. If the transformation sometimes fails to take place, it is that we are too sparing of our indulgence—we purposely say indulgence, and not pity, for in pity there can be no prodigality. Under M. Hugo’s guidance we must learn, like the royal convert Clovis, not only to burn what we have adored, but to

adore what we have burned. The social bases are to be changed. Guilt lies not with the sinner, but with the law—punishment constitutes the crime. Valjean sums up this doctrine before his judges when he tells them: ‘*Les galères font le galérien.*’ But what matters it, since out of ‘*galériens*’ saints are so easily manufactured? Why should youth struggle to avoid the first taint of sin, if you teach that one may wallow knee-deep in the mire and keep the inner self unspotted before God? Why fear to tread these paths if there is no loss of souls by the way? A few kind words from an unquestioning philanthropist, accompanied by a liberal donation, wipe away all and operate the conversion. There is no repentance, no regret even, in Fantine; she glories to the end in the revolting sacrifice she has made to maternal love. She enters into her apotheosis because she meets with good M. Madeleine; as M. Madeleine, when he was Jean Valjean, met with the good Bishop.

As there is joy in Heaven for the repentant sinner, so let there be honour on earth. Nor should we here below look too closely into repentance; punishment—in other words, non-success—is a sufficient atonement. When luckless crime stands face to face with the law, let the law have its bond—but no more. There is a debtor and creditor account open between justice and guilt; that account settled, they are once more on equal terms. Let us have no yellow passports putting Society on its guard; no invidious supervision hampering the free action of the liberated convict; no aggravation of punishment for a relapse into crime! Let due respect attend the solvent debtor of the law who has paid off his heavy score. If ‘*Les Misérables*’ do not mean this, they mean nothing. True it is that the convict may have been better fed, better housed, and better clothed, than many of the struggling thousands who would starve rather than steal even a loaf; and that for some of these that secondary punishment of the world’s contempt and mistrust, which a specious philanthropy would abolish, has had, may be, more preventive virtue in it than the menace of a comparatively comfortable prison. Still truer is it, that for many a friendless, tempted Fantine, shame is the mercifully threatening angel whose flaming sword guards the portals of vice. For the law has no terrors in that case; the best instincts of human nature are often the abettors of a first fault; and the rewards or punishments of another world seem but too often hazy and distant to many youthful minds.

Fantine is, indirectly, the cause of the catastrophe which terminates Jean Valjean’s prosperity under the assumed name of M. Madeleine, by bringing him into collision with Javert the

police agent. After we have introduced Javert to our readers, and given an account of Valjean's self-denunciation and trial, which is, beyond comparison, the most stirring incident of the whole work, we shall not examine further, with any minuteness, '*Les Misérables*' as a novel. We have thought it better to circumscribe the field of criticism and to analyse conscientiously a few of the most important characters, than to ramble through the maze of ten volumes crowded with secondary personages. One might as well sit down deliberately to tell dreams, as to attempt to follow, pen in hand, M. Hugo through the labyrinth of his story.

Javert was inspector of police at M.-sur-M., where M. Madeleine was mayor. His character is both well drawn and well sustained:—

'Javert was born in a prison. His mother was a fortune-teller, whose husband was at the galleys. As he grew up, he came to understand that he was irremediably an outcast. He noticed that there were two sets of men to whom Society inexorably refuses admittance—the men by whom Society is attacked, and those by whom it is defended. His choice lay between those two classes. He had an innate fund of rectitude, punctuality, and probity, with an undefinable hatred for that vagrant race to which he belonged by birth. So he entered the police. . . . He was made up of two very simple notions, which were good in their way, but which he turned almost to evil by carrying them to excess—respect for authority, and hatred of rebellion. In his sight, murder, theft, and indeed crimes of any kind, were only rebellion under different shapes. He enveloped in a common feeling of blind veneration every functionary, from the prime minister down to the beadle. He regarded with contempt, aversion, and disgust all those who had crossed, even once, the legal threshold of wrong. He was absolute, and admitted no exceptions. . . . He had made a straight line out of all that was most tortuous on earth. He had the consciousness of being useful: he believed in his functions—he was a spy, as other men are priests. Woe to those who fell into his hands! He would have arrested his father, and denounced his mother.'

So far the character of Javert is traced, with a masterly hand. But, as usual, M. Hugo works himself up in his description till he quite loses sight of all moral perspective and proportion, or propriety of terms; and we have this police agent described in untranslatable language, as '*un mouchard 'marmoréen,' 'Brutus dans Vidocq,'* or, still more singularly as '*un composé bizarre du Spartiate, du Romain, du moine et du caporal, espion incapable d'un mensonge, mouchard vierge!*' We are, moreover, told that '*in his ingenuous look one seemed to fathom the depths of his unenlightened but rigid and 'chaste conscience!*' Javert, however, is a very life-like

personage, and one can well fancy him watching M. Madeleine with mistrust. Any man whose past life was not well known would have been naturally an object of suspicion to this human blood-hound. But this was not all; Javert in his youth had been employed at the galleys of Toulon, and thought he recognised a well-known face. There was but one man, to his knowledge, who could perform the feats of strength of which M. Madeleine had shown himself capable, and that was a convict named Jean Valjean, whom he had known at Toulon. Moreover, M. Madeleine had an awkward way of dragging one leg—a strong indication for those who have watched the shambling gait of chained convicts. Nothing seems more natural than that Javert should have suspected the Mayor; the really surprising thing is, that the Mayor, in his turn, should not have recognised Javert at once. If this latter could remember one out of the numerous prisoners he had had under his rule, how much more likely was it that the wretched convict should recollect the face of his keeper and temporary master. Valjean was altered in every respect, whereas Javert was exactly in the same position at M.-sur-M. as at Toulon. One would have thought that M. Madeleine would have been on his guard with the police in general. At any rate, Javert's mysterious innuendoes might well have awakened his alarm. Nothing would have been easier than to have used his influence to obtain promotion for the obnoxious spy, and to have had him removed from M.-sur-M. But M. Hugo's personages never do what they might be naturally expected to do, so M. Madeleine let the storm burst.

On the occasion of a street quarrel, Javert, as inspector of police, takes up Fantine, and has her conveyed to the station-house. There, on his sole authority, he condemns her to six months' imprisonment; and to her passionate appeals and intreaties for mercy, sternly replies:—*'Marche à présent. Tu as tes six mois. Le Père Éternel en personne n'y pourrait plus rien !'** .

* Surely M. Hugo must have been aware that his model Inspector Javert was going far beyond his power. On this occasion he says:—*'The class of women to which Fantine belonged is placed by our laws completely at the mercy of the police. The police deals with them as it pleases, punishes them at will, and can arbitrarily lay its embargo on those two dismal things they call their liberty and their trade.'* There is no doubt a certain amount of truth in this statement which it might be both useful and merciful to bring under public notice, but, as usual, M. Hugo spoils all by his exaggeration. No police agent could have done more than arrest Fantine provi-

M. Madeleine, who has been an unobserved spectator of the whole affair, interferes, and declares that the woman shall be released on the spot; but Fantine, in the frenzy of her despair, has not heard his words, she has only understood one thing—that she is in presence of that hated M. Madeleine who has turned her out of his factory—the author of all her misery—and turning fiercely upon him, she exclaims:—‘So you are ‘the Mayor, are you?’ and spits in his face. Naturally enough Javert is more than ever disposed to have her carried off to prison; but M. Madeleine, merely wiping his face, reiterates the order to set Fantine at liberty. No wonder Javert thinks that when the Mayor allows himself to be publicly insulted, it is time for subordinates to assert the dignity of authority, and remonstrate, but M. Madeleine bids him sternly to be gone. That very night Javert sends off a letter to the *Préfecture de Police*, stating that he has good reason to suppose that M. Madeleine, the mayor of M.-sur-M., is no other than the ex-convict Jean Valjean.

The reply soon comes—Javert is mistaken. M. Madeleine cannot be Valjean, for Valjean is found; he is lying in prison at the very moment at Arras, and is going to take his trial at the Assizes. On learning this, Javert thinks it his duty to inform M. Madeleine of his suspicions and delation, and to demand his own dismissal from office on that account. ‘He ‘has been wanting in respect to a superior, and deserves punishment.’ M. Hugo has succeeded, perhaps beyond his wish, in conferring a certain moral dignity on this obscure police agent. The fact is, that the other characters of ‘*Les Misérables*’ are so inconsistent and so purely the creatures of impulse, that, by comparison, even the villainous spy is ennobled by his sense of duty. Brute as he is, he seems to represent Society, and—though under their worst aspects—the ties which bind civilised men together. Indeed, one cannot help feeling that he utters

sionally. The *Préfet de Police* in Paris, and in the provinces the *Préfet* or the Mayor, could alone have had authority to detain her in prison for *six weeks at most*. We speak of the present day. The fact is that M. Hugo creates confusion in the mind of the reader by writing in the present tense as an accuser of Society, and in the past as a novelist. Thus in the much-admired chapter called ‘*La Cadène*,’ which gives a hideous and evidently greatly magnified account, even for forty years ago, of the departure of chained convicts in cartloads from the prison of Bicêtre, he represents a state of things which has long ceased to exist. Whether one puts upon trial an individual or the abstract being called Society, it is contrary to justice to bring forward the crimes of a former generation.

the truest sentence in the whole book, when he tells M. Madeleine that the kindness which consists in always taking part with the inferior against the superior, is a bad sort of kindness: 'With such kindness as that, Society would be disorganised. It is easy enough to be kind, the hard thing is to be just.'

Through Javert, Valjean learns the story of the man who has been mistaken for him, and who is about to suffer in his stead. A poor half-witted labourer, called Champmathieu, is taken up on suspicion of having stolen some cider-apples. He has been found with the broken branch of the apple-tree in his hand, and conveyed to prison. (France, if we are to believe M. Hugo, would seem to be a hard country for poor folks.) In the jail an ex-convict had recognised him, and had declared that he was Jean Valjean. Many minor circumstances had corroborated this statement. Two other men who had been at the galleys with Valjean, and Javert himself, had been confronted with the prisoner, and had all pronounced that Champmathieu was no other than Valjean. The theft of the apples, which was a mere misdemeanour in a common offender, was a crime in the eyes of the law when committed by an ex-convict. The supposed Valjean was accused of having scaled the orchard wall, and if convicted would be sentenced to the galleys for life. 'Then, there was that affair of Petit-Gervais, which would come on, of course. The trial was to take place on the following day, said Javert.'

M. Madeleine is left to his reflections, and M. Hugo has described them in a wonderful chapter. It is one of those bits of moral dissection of which French writers of the present day are so prodigal, and which are invariably designated, in the language of modern criticism, as 'psychological analyses.' M. Hugo has indulged frequently in this kind of mental exercise, but never so successfully as on this occasion. The workings of the brain, and the conflicting emotions of the heart, of Valjean in that night of agony, are fearfully and minutely described. If he remains silent, and allows Champmathieu to be condemned, he is safe for evermore. That yawning gulf of the galleys, ever ready to swallow him up, would close upon another victim. There would be a Jean Valjean—real or false—slaving at Toulon; the law would ask no more, and M. Madeleine might live and die respected! If he speaks, M. Madeleine, respectability, quiet, the fortune of hundreds, power to do good—all disappear; the red jacket, the shaved head, the wretched pallet, the shame, the staring shuddering crowd, the hideous companionship, the whip and the chain, and all the thousand horrors

of his former life, take possession of him once more till death. The whole chapter is a masterpiece.

The better feeling triumphs, and M. Madeleine — M. Madeleine for the last time— goes to Arras, and declares that he is Valjean. The scene at the Assizes is very effective, though perhaps unnecessarily melodramatic. Matters might, we think, have been managed more quietly; but we have shuddered, like all M. Hugo's readers, and are disarmed. Champmathieu is of course released; and M. Madeleine, in the first moment of stupor caused by his generous self-devotion, is suffered to depart.

And now comes the great blemish of the book as a work of fiction—a piece of improbability so glaring that it amounts to absurdity. It becomes difficult to take any interest in adventures and dangers resulting from a situation of which no reader of common sense can, for one instant, admit the possibility. Valjean, when in court, not content with proclaiming his identity—the only thing necessary to procure Champmathieu's liberation—wantonly accuses himself of having robbed the Bishop, a crime for which he had received pardon: and of having taken Petit-Gervais' money eight years before—a fact of which there could be no possible proof. On his return home, he even takes the precaution of signing a declaration to that effect, and depositing on his table Petit-Gervais' two-franc piece as material evidence.

In the meantime, the tribunal of Arras, determined, we suppose, not to be outdone in eccentricity, instead of signing a collective petition to obtain Jean Valjean's pardon in consideration of his good behaviour for years and his last magnanimous sacrifice, issues an order of arrest, which Javert executes with fiendish glee. Valjean is seized at the bedside of Fantine, who is in the hospital, and has only time to promise the dying mother that he will devote his life to Cosette, happen what may.

At this point of the story the author appears to have felt some difficulty in getting on; but he puts a bold front upon it, and, instead of relating Valjean's trial, merely says: 'Our readers will thank us for sparing them painful details.' The reader, who hitherto has been spared nothing, instead of being grateful, is disappointed by this tardy regard for his feelings. It might have been supposed that any reader who had got to the end of Fantine's story had nerves that required no consideration. But this mysterious fashion of glossing over inexplicable incidents is a very favourite device of M. Hugo's, even where there is no fear of over-exciting our sensibility. He very

often has recourse to sentences such as these: 'no one ever knew exactly how it happened,' or, 'it would be difficult to account for this circumstance,'—a very convenient mode of getting out of a puzzle, which we recommend to young novelists. It has the two-fold advantage of saving a vast amount of literary labour, and of imparting a certain easy air of truthfulness to the narrative. It seems to say: 'I only relate that of which I am perfectly sure; I prefer remaining silent on doubtful points.' For our part, we confess that we should have been very curious to know how that Petit-Gervais affair was conducted. The theft had been committed in broad daylight by an unarmed man, in the absence of any witness, on a wandering child, who was not likely to have lodged a complaint. For such an offence, supposing it could be proved, we had fancied that the penalty in France would have been a short term of imprisonment and a fine,—a punishment which would have been somewhat aggravated by the fact of Valjean's being a liberated convict; moreover, we had an impression, derived from the *Code d'Instruction Criminelle*, that, after a lapse of so many years, Valjean would have been entitled to prescriptive impunity. However, by this time our readers will have found out that the penal code of France, as interpreted by M. Hugo, is fearfully Draconian; and, consequently, they will not be surprised to learn that Valjean was condemned to death. The sentence was commuted into that of hard labour for life by Louis XVIII.,—a just and merciful prince. Not the least surprising part of the affair is that Valjean, who valued liberty, we are told, especially because it gave him the power of being useful, made no defence, and did not appeal from his sentence. Yet here was an opportunity of turning his sufferings to account for the general good. He might have pleaded with authority the cause of his fellow-convicts, and have pointed out the difficulties which lay in the path of redemption. But M. Hugo seldom seems desirous of grappling seriously with his subject; he is satisfied with having proclaimed a grievance, and rarely seeks the remedy by which it can be removed; his object is evidently accusation, rather than amendment.

The incidents and characters we have hitherto discussed are all to be found in the two first volumes of '*Les Misérables*.' The author, not his critics, must be held responsible for the disproportionate share of attention which these first volumes have universally attracted. They contain the real interest of his story, and the spirit of his doctrine. If we may be allowed so homely a comparison, we would liken '*Les Misérables*' to an enormous kite: there is a large wide head, and a long — a

very long — narrow tail, composed of detached bits of learning, paradox or pathos, as the case may be, tied up and connected with a slight thread of adventure. These appendages of strangely-variegated hue have been very useful in flying the socialist machine which M. Hugo has sent up so triumphantly into the highest regions of popularity. Every now and then the story seems to come fluttering, flapping, and diving downwards to the ground; but, with one sharp pull at the string, and a brisk lyrical run into the domain of history or poetry, the author soon gets it up again. His flattering portrait of Louis-Philippe,—his praise of Napoleon I.—his outbursts of sentimental *religiosity*.—to borrow a very useful French neologism,—and, above all, his account of the battle of Waterloo, so palatable to popular feeling in France,—have served, in great measure, to balance the obnoxious theories which form the framework of the book.

The remainder of Valjean's adventures we shall not attempt to relate fully. They are bound up with those of a host of inferior characters, whom it would be impossible to introduce to our readers. What is personal to him is soon told. He had become once more that nameless, numbered thing — a convict; and had been consigned to the galleys for life, as number 9,430. But he manages to make his escape in a manner which might have been barely possible to an amphibious monkey—if one can imagine such a creature. He jumps from the main-yard of a man-of-war into the sea, dives, and swims under water to a ship at some distance, and from thence to a distant part of the coast. Of course he is reported drowned. He goes to Montfermeil, rescues Cosette, Fantine's child, from the Thénardiens, and takes her to live with him as his daughter. As a general rule, he may be said to do exactly the contrary of what prudence and good sense dictate. Although he is rich, and has every motive for avoiding notice, he selects for his abode a disreputable old house, in one of the most lonely parts of Paris,—in fact, just one of those places on which the police would be sure to have an eye. He dresses so shabbily, that a penny is frequently offered to him in the streets, while he, in his turn, distributes silver coin to the poor, so that he gets the nickname of 'the almsgiving beggar.' To crown all, he confides a thousand-franc note to the old woman of the house to get change! No wonder Javert finds him out. For some incomprehensible reason,—most probably to give the author an opportunity of relating a most thrilling chase through the streets of Paris,—Javert does not lay hold of him at once, and he is enabled, with Cosette in his arms, who is now a child of eight, to give the

police once more the slip. He climbs up a wall of twenty feet high, drawing up Cosette after him, and falls on the other side into a convent garden. Into this convent, after many dangers and wonderful adventures, Valjean and Cosette are admitted, the former as a gardener, and the latter as a pupil. This furnishes M. Hugo with a pretext for inserting a hundred pages on monastic institutions.

When Cosette's education is terminated, they leave the convent, and she in due time falls in love with Marius de Pontmercy, the young gentleman who gives his name to the third part of '*Les Misérables*.' Of Marius we will only say that he is as insipid a lover as we remember to have met with in any novel, which is saying a great deal. Valjean, on discovering the loves of Marius and Cosette, is stung by that morbid jealousy which all tender parents in modern French novels are supposed to feel when their children desire to marry; and on this occasion we have another 'psychological analysis.' In fact, instead of being thankful that Cosette should find a protector more efficient than himself, he determines to carry her off, and separate her from Marius. Marius, on losing his beloved, rushes to the barricades (the date is 1832) where Valjean joins him,—it is not clearly explained why. Here we have a whole volume in glorification of civil war, and even a chapter on the insurrection of June, 1848, which as yet was in the womb of Time. Behind the barricades, Javert and Valjean meet once more; Javert is recognised as a spy, and handed over to Valjean for execution; but this latter spares the life of his old enemy, and not only sets him free, but, with true Hugo bombast, gives him his address,—an unaccountable piece of needless generosity, after studiously hiding from the police for years.

The barricade is taken, and Marius is desperately wounded. Valjean, who has conquered his bitter feelings, takes the almost lifeless young man on his back, and escapes with him through the man-hole of one of the great sewers. Of all the incredible feats performed by Valjean, this is certainly the most wonderful. He wades for hours in the dark through the horrible filthy tide that flows through the sewers, and which sometimes reaches to his chin, supporting at the same time the weight of the inanimate form of Marius. For a young man it would be an impossible exploit, and Valjean is sixty-three. On issuing from the sewers on the quays of the Seine, he finds himself once more face to face with Javert, and Javert for the first time of his life, finds himself in presence of a dilemma of conscience. Hitherto his line of duty had never been doubtful, and to his duty he was a slave. But now he must either give up the man

who had spared his life on the barricade, or leave the law unavenged. Valjean was an escaped convict, a rebel, and perhaps a murderer, for Marius was to all appearance a corpse. Should he, Javert, the incorruptible, though humble instrument of social authority, suffer him to go free? We have said that the character of Javert was the most consistent of the whole work; and we think that M. Hugo is justified in making him commit suicide to escape from the torment of conflicting duties. He was evidently not a man to spend much time in self-contemplation or 'psychological analysis' of any kind.

The last volume — we write the word joyfully — is devoted to the marriage of Cosette, and the death of Valjean. This latter, who is fated to be always struggling with his own conscience, and who, when he acts virtuously, invariably overdoes the right thing, behaves in the most unaccountable manner. He keeps his past life, and even Cosette's birth and parentage, a profound secret from Marius until the marriage is concluded. He even manages to get his adopted daughter married under a feigned name: a rather difficult task for any one, save for a novelist, considering the strictness of French law in respect to marriage. On the day following the wedding, however, when the revelation is no longer imperiously demanded by honesty, he goes to Marius and tells his fearful story without preparation. He acknowledges that he is an escaped convict, who has spent nineteen years at the galleys, but carefully avoids giving any of the particulars which palliate his apparent guilt. As might be expected, Marius, who is not aware that he owes his life to Valjean, regards him with horror, and under these circumstances, Valjean, though his heart is full, suggests that it will be better for him to retire from the family party and see less of Cosette in future. Marius feebly demurs, and it is at last decided that the old man shall see Cosette every day during a short visit. But Cosette is selfishly happy with her young husband, and does not even perceive that her adopted father's visits grow shorter and less frequent every day. Valjean feels that he is no longer necessary to her happiness, and retires more and more. At last, when the young couple find out the truth, and rush in repentant haste to his lodgings, it is too late, the old man is dying of a broken heart.

The style in which these things are written is of a piece with the disordered violence of the intellect which gives them birth. The one step which is said to divide the sublime from the ridiculous has no terrors for M. Hugo. He stands perpetually, Colossus-like, astride on the frontier, with one foot in either domain. At all times the chief characteristic of his diction has

been a great propensity to startling antithesis and paradox. Success and advancing years have produced their usual result, and magnified the defect into a deformity. His writing now consists in a strain of screaming discords, both of form and matter. Black is laid upon white—great things are opposed to small—beauty to hideousness—excessive sanctity to excessive crime—pompous terms are applied to trivial things—and homely expressions to the most lofty ideas.

Take for example the following specimen, which we shall not attempt to translate:—

‘Ecraser les fanatismes et vénérer l’Infini, telle est la loi. Ne nous bornons pas à nous prosterner sous l’arbre Création, et à contempler ses immenses branchages pleins d’astres. Nous avons un devoir : travailler à l’âme humaine, défendre le mystère contre le miracle, adorer l’incompréhensible et rejeter l’absurde, n’admettre en fait d’inexplicable que le nécessaire, assainir la croyance, ôter les superstitions de dessus la religion ; ÉCHENILLER Dieu.’

As some of our readers, mistrusting their own knowledge, will doubtless look out the word *écheniller* in a French dictionary, we may as well tell them at once that it means nothing more than the act of picking caterpillars off a tree.

M. Hugo has no claim to indulgence. He is a poet, an orator, and a master of language in his way. No writer of the present day has a greater command of words; and yet he has taken with his native language—of all modern languages the least tolerant of disrespect—liberties which have never been equalled. Like the Emperor Sigismund, he seems to say, with royal indifference, that he is *supra grammaticam*.

We shall not, however, discuss any further M. Hugo’s literary sins. Our severity has not been called forth by them. English critics are not bound to avenge his outrages on the French language. It is his influence as a social and political teacher—it is the world-wide circulation of his pernicious book, translated, as far as such jargon is translateable, into all languages—that have imposed on us the duty of judging him. We are tempted, in concluding, to paraphrase freely his preface to ‘*Les Misérables*,’ and to account for our review in very nearly the same words that he has used to account for his book. ‘So long as there shall exist, by reason of certain political and literary laws, writers creating artificially in the midst of civilisation an imaginary social damnation, and complicating with evil passions and class hatred our destiny, which is divine, so long criticism such as ours may not be utterly useless.’

- ART. VIII.—1. *The Prison Chaplain: A Memoir of the Rev. John Clay, B.D., late Chaplain of Preston Gaol; with selections from his Reports and Correspondence, and a Sketch of Prison Discipline in England.* By his Son, the Rev. WALTER LOWE CLAY, M.A. London: 1861.
2. *Female Life in Prison.* By a Prison Matron. Second Edition, in two vols. London: 1862.
3. *Observations on the Treatment of Convicts in Ireland; with some Remarks on the same in England.* By Four Visiting Justices of the West Riding Prison at Wakefield. London: 1862.
4. *Report of Committees of both Houses of Parliament on Transportation and Penal Servitude.* 1856.
5. *Reports of the Directors of Convict Prisons, England.* 1861.
6. *Reports of the Directors of Convict Prisons, Ireland.* 1861.

THE country is in the midst of one of its occasional panics about its convicts,—at present particularly active in the commission they seem to hold from the enemy of mankind to roam abroad, seeking whom they may devour. Once more, as so often before, we find ‘the criminal class dominant, excessively formidable, and costly,’ as one of the Reports before us described it some few years ago. Nobody disputes the fact, except a blind theorist here and there. As to the mischief, and the disgrace of it, there are no two opinions. Yet we can remember no occasion, within half a century, on which so much ignorance has been exhibited, and so much nonsense has been talked, on a question which any sensible man may understand, and the facts of which are generally accessible. Ignorance and passion together make sad havoc of citizen-sense; and, between the popular weariness of the topic of Prison Discipline, which everybody has heard of *ad nauseam*, while few have studied it, and the wrath and terror with which we find our lives, limbs, and property at the mercy of the ruffianism of Saint Giles’s, a confusion of ideas and counsels has been generated, almost as discreditable to English society as its mismanagement of its criminals. Some, who should know better, are crying out for a revival of transportation. Some vituperate an imaginary enemy—the ‘Humanitarians,’—who would feed our scoundrels on the fat of the laud, and coax and humour them back to virtue. Some—perhaps the majority—imagine all discharged convicts to be ticket-of-leave men; and a multitude assume

that tickets-of-leave are bad things in themselves, because the 'system' which has been called after them is a failure. Some profess to be in a horribly vindictive state of mind towards our garotters and burglars, and others really are so—not only when walking the streets of London armed, and peering into every bit of shadow for a murderer, but in letters to the newspapers, at dinner-tables, and by their own firesides. Some abuse all gaol-chaplains, or all directors of prisons, or the Home Secretaries of many successive Ministries, or the police, or anybody who has to do with convicts, or anything to propose about them. There are but few who perceive, amidst the confusion, that the radical difficulty remains untouched and unapproached—what to do with the element of extreme wickedness—with the coarsest dregs of national crime,—which has never been successfully dealt with in any country since modern civilisation arose. It is not scolding which will enable us to deal with this great difficulty; and we are carried further away from any solution by every fit of chattering that ignorance indulges in, and by every outburst of passion. The evil is very pressing—there is not a day to lose in dealing with it; and we shall therefore try to do our part towards wise action on the question by presenting a clear and accurate account of the nature and conditions of the case.

It may be said, in excuse for the ignorance which is creating so much confusion, that in no department of public affairs has the Government of England shown a more wretched and mischievous indecision and fickleness than in that of convict management. Whatever allowance may be fairly claimed for an uncertain and wavering policy in a matter so difficult and, in a sense, so new, it remains a fact that successive Administrations, and even the same Ministry and Parliament, have shifted from one ground to another, and changed their minds—not only from one period of experience to another, but while preparing one Report, or in the interval between completing the Report and presenting the Bill ostensibly founded upon it. Where the Legislature and Executive have been so fluctuating in their counsels, it is not very wonderful that society has become confused in its ideas. The time has arrived, however, when there must be an end of such weakness. Society must make out a clear aim for itself, and then see that Government carries it out.

The aim is, as most people say who are qualified to speak on the subject at all, to reduce as much as possible the number of the criminal population, and to prevent the incorrigible part of it from doing mischief. Nothing that has ever been effected in

England entitles us to expect the fulfilment of this aim. Our Reformatories and Ragged Schools have done much towards cutting off the supply of criminals at its main source; but the criminal class remains 'dominant' on the whole. There is a great increase of crimes of violence without any excuse from external hardship: and to nothing but mismanagement can it be ascribed. This is the more evident from the fact that a different administration of a convict system nominally the same in Ireland has resulted in half-emptying the prisons, in diminishing crime to an extraordinary degree, and in retrieving eighty per cent. of the convicts. It must be understood that this is something different from knowing that twenty per cent. are incorrigible, and assuming that the rest are reformed. It means that eighty per cent. of the discharged prisoners are doing well, while the other twenty are the incorrigible and the unknown. We shall have to speak afterwards of this success, and of the attendant difficulty which meets us on every hand—what to do with the incorrigible. At present our business is with our English failures.

The Judicial Statistics of 1861 (the latest procurable) show that in England and Wales the total number of criminals of all orders and both sexes is 148,972, or 1 in 134 of the whole population,—London having only 1 in 231. This estimate includes receivers of stolen goods, suspected persons, children, prostitutes, and vagrants. Crimes of violence were 7,535, of which 2,473 were against the person without regard to property. The known adult thieves in the country in 1861 were 25,272, of whom 19,215 were men, and 6,057 were women. The number of suspected thieves was 29,588, of whom 24,226 were men, and 5,362 were women. The known and the suspected thieves under the age of sixteen were between four and five thousand of each class. Such is the criminal population that we have to deal with.

The increase of commitments in 1861 was remarkable. It amounted to nearly 13,000—the whole number being 129,238. Dismissing here the cases of slight offences, and matters not pertinent to our present inquiry, we find that at the opening of the year there were in prison, undergoing their sentence, 7,794 convicts, of whom 6,474 were men, to whom were added in the course of the year 2,718 men, making at the end of the year 9,192 men and 1,684 women; in all, 10,876.

As for what became of these criminals, 610 were sent to Western Australia. A few were sent to lunatic asylums, had their sentences commuted, or were pardoned; 76 died and 2 escaped. Passing over irrelevant particulars like these, we

find that 1,149 men and 201 women fulfilled their sentences and went out; and 1,377 men and 268 women were discharged with tickets-of-leave. This left in prison at the beginning of 1862, 7,123 convicts undergoing their sentence, after 3,753 had been disposed of.

The statements of the cost of these convicts do not enlighten us much as to what we pay for the crime of the country. The expense per head of the convicts is reported as so various that it is difficult to understand—the extremes being 20*l.* and 87*l.* The average is announced to be 34*l.* 9*s.* 9*d.* It is more to our purpose here to cite the estimate made some years ago, and still adhered to by competent reporters, that the crime of the country costs it ten millions a year, without reckoning some such items as the salaries of the judges, and the expenses of our convicts in the colonies. What a sum it is!—and to be spent without success in the object!

The present attempt to raise a popular cry for a revival of transportation is worse than foolish—it is wicked; because any man who undertakes to write on the subject ought to know—we should say, must know—that the thing is impossible. The time is almost beyond living memory when Romilly and Bentham took up their testimony against that mode of punishment; but some of their opinions are to be found in their works and their memoranda. Romilly's diary shows us his grounds of objection in regard to the effect on the criminals themselves; and it gives us the curious anecdote that some of the judges of that day (1812) made their sentences of transportation as long as the law allowed, and for life when it was possible, because it was certain that a man sentenced to such a term as seven years would not be transported at all, but kept on board the hulks. Three of the judges are named as declaring this to be their practice.* There were grave defects, Romilly said, in the transportation system which made him desire, with Bentham, that it should be given up as soon as possible; and the expense, which it is convenient now to overlook, was severely felt at that time. That method of punishment had, a quarter of a century ago, cost us seven millions; it should now be remembered.

We need not recall what the experience of the last generation proved to satiety,—the intolerable moral evils of the system. We could fill a volume with the indisputable grievances of the inhabitants of penal colonies, after it began to be seen what the results of the system were; but it is unnecessary. There is a Report in existence which answers that

* *Memoirs of Romilly*, vol. ii. p. 71–2.

purpose most effectually. After some agitation by Sir William Molesworth and Archbishop Whately, a Committee of the Commons was appointed in 1837 to consider and report on the Transportation question; and the evidence before that Committee must have settled it for ever. It was so understood at the time by the whole body of lawyers in the country, as well as by moralists and statesmen. 'Probably,' says Mr. Clay, 'no volume was ever published in England of which the contents were so loathsome as the appendix to the Committee's Report.' The point which chiefly interests us here is, that the grand difficulty was as far from a solution in Australia as it is here,—what to do with the *crème de la crème* of British ruffianism. There was a Norfolk Island there,—a lower deep below the depths,—a hell where men slew each other to get removed, even though the gallows was the goal of the journey. Beside Norfolk Island, there was the hell of the Bush; and to anxious husbands and tender fathers among the honest colonists every home had some of the pains of hell in it while surrounded by a convict population.

The moral impossibility of continuing transportation was proved by the labours of that Committee. The impossibility, in fact, has been settled since by the refusal of all our colonies, in succession, to harbour the scoundrelism of the mother country. Western Australia receives a small annual number; but it is on the express condition that the immigrants shall not be of the worst class of offenders, but hopeful subjects for reform. As these are a class which we do not want to get rid of, we may look on Western Australia as no exception to the general rule of the colonies which decline to receive our really troublesome criminals.

Those who now renew the demand for transportation should remember (and should not suppose that others forget) that the members of both Houses, who sat in committee on our penal system in 1856, were as strongly in favour of transportation as it was possible to be; and yet they announced in their reports that the scheme was impracticable. They even examined the question, whether a penal settlement might not be formed on the Gulf of Carpentaria,—the site so urgently recommended of late,—and declared against it. The reasons may be seen by referring to the Report. We need not discuss them here; as all we have to say about transportation is to show that all discussion of it as a remedy for our present trouble is mere waste of time and thought. We shall have opportunity to exhibit a natural and most beneficial process of convict emigration, as a regular result of well-conducted convict discipline at home.

Instituted in any other way, and as a part of the punishment, the evils are the same that they always were. The few hundreds a year that Western Australia will receive must be only moderately criminal when selected; and thus we are not helped in our main difficulty; the cost is very heavy; and, far worse, the voyage in a convict ship destroys all the good that can have been done in the prison, and all prospect of future respectability. As for sending forth our brutes and devils, to do as the same class have done before on the fresh lands of the colonies, no citizen who knows the true history of transportation can fail to see that it is altogether too late to return to a scheme which nothing but inexperience could excuse our ever having tried at all.

The main cause of our failure in convict management is the uncertainty of our opinions, our schemes, and the fulfilment of our avowed purposes. The indecision and fickleness began with our reforms half a century ago, and are seen now, not only in the chaos of notions of what should be done, but in the infliction of punishment. We may remember the increase of crime while 'death recorded' was a mere new name for transportation, and was treated as a sham by criminals; and we see the same consequence now from the confusion and uncertainty of alternative sentences, while the strict measure and conditions of the alternative are dropped out of the management. The ticket-of-leave is lightly and improperly given, and its conditions are subsequently neglected; and thus all the evils of uncertainty of punishment are incurred without the benefits of a well-conducted license system being secured. This is only the latest phase of the indecision of mind of our legislators and ministers which has been helping to make the criminal class 'dominant' in England for a long course of years.

We can only glance rapidly over what was done before the important year 1853. Thirty years ago we had, on one hand, the treadmill and painful remains of the old system, half-starvation, cold, and dirt; while, on the other hand, there were gaols where the convicts had little work, good living, and a great deal of liberty. We had, at the same time, attempts at a silent system and a solitary system, and prisons where there was no classification and hardly any restraint. The reformers of that day were charged with demanding Turkey carpets, wine, and wax candles for their pet convicts; and the criminals put forth all their ingenuity to get into comfortable prisons, and to bring in as many of their acquaintance as possible. That was the beginning of the 'Humanitarian' scandal which ignorant people, furious against the thieves of the day, want to make

out to be existing still, though our reformers are wiser by a generation than the prisoners' friends of thirty years ago. Millbank Prison, with its discipline, was dreaded by the criminal class; but while 20,000 of them were annually sentenced to nominal transportation, Millbank could receive only one thousand; and thus the most gambling class of society ventured the stake, saying that the chances were nineteen to one in favour of transportation, which was then popular, or of the hulks, which were rather liked also. On the whole, crime increased so fearfully, and the new-born Statistical Society so alarmed the country with an exposition of the cost of crime, that everybody cried out for some sharp and short way of dealing with thieves, murderers, and incendiaries. (It was the period of rick-burning.) We had divisions of the kingdom into prison-districts; we had inspectors, new gaols on one system or another; here a prison where silence was unbroken; there a prison where no man ever saw another man's face, except when the officials looked in upon him; and everywhere the argument went hotly on,—what should be the main object in the treatment of convicts,—the security of society or the reformation of the offender; and if both, which first? That time now looks very remote; yet it is only very recently that the argument has been established on its right ground. Everybody now agrees that the security of society is all that the judicial department of Government is concerned with; and that the real question is, whether that social security can be obtained by any other means than the reformation of offenders.

From 1835 onwards good preparation for future action was made by the Duke of Richmond's Committee, Reports, and Bills; and the immediate fruits were the removal of criminal lunatics from the gaols and the establishment of the first State reformatory, Parkhurst, at the close of 1838. The Richmond Committee were in favour of the silent system; but in 1839 Lord Russell obtained the passage of the Separate System Act. In 1840, the model prison at Pentonville was begun; and it was opened, under the countenance of Sir R. Peel's Government, at the close of 1842. From that time there were three gaols in England which were watched as exemplars of the separate system: Pentonville, Reading, and the new portion of the prison at Preston. It is easy to imagine how the criminal class regarded all this experimenting on their case; and how interesting to them must have been all the illustration, in fiction, in the newspapers, and in Parliament, of the weak points of the management in each of the celebrated gaols.

At that time the confusion had reached its height, from the

sudden stoppage of transportation to New South Wales, and its fearful inundation of Van Diemen's Land. The hulks were overcrowded, and Parliament insisted that no convicts should be detained at home on account of the change. Under this difficulty, Ministers were too glad to listen to the proposal which came from Van Diemen's Land, under the hand of Sir John Franklin,—that a system of 'Probation' should be tried. The scheme was sanctioned; and the Pentonville convicts were to supply the material of the experiment. Sir J. Franklin had been misled as to the facts of the case; and he drew back before the sanction from home could reach him. There was every element of failure in the scheme; Sir J. Franklin's successor struggled hard to carry on his government under the embarrassment of it, and died heart-broken when the disclosure of the immitigable corruption of the colony was made. Amidst the confusion of notions at home, after this, Lord Brougham's Committee sat for the purpose of obtaining evidence and opinions which might afford material for the foundation of a stable and consistent penal system. This aim was not accomplished. The Juvenile Offenders' Bill was one consequence of it,—an Act which did little or no good. The balance of opinion was, on the whole, in favour of a further trial of separate confinement; but there was as yet little encouragement to any great extension of it. In one of the three pattern gaols the mental health of the convicts was bad; in another the pursuit of letters, instead of industrial work, was a topic of ridicule everywhere; and in the Preston Gaol only was the method decisively successful. Sir George Grey had proposed penal public works; but the sentimentality which was then at its height in regard to convicts made a prodigious outcry about the hardening effect of public labour on the convicts, and the corrupting influence of the spectacle on the neighbourhood. Government decided to continue the first and second stages of punishment,—the prison solitude, succeeded by probationary labour on public works, and then to send the men to Australia, not free as before, but under the conditions of the ticket-of-leave, till their sentence had expired. The plan was spoiled, as any plan would have been spoiled, by the continuance in use of the hulks where the penal labour was carried on. The cholera in 1849 caused a due demand for their abolition, and they were condemned in 1850. But it was not till 1856 that we were rid of them entirely.

Meantime, 'the mark system' was the new experiment of the day. Captain Maconochie had tried it in Norfolk Island, and, when recalled from thence, obtained permission to make the experiment at home. A man of benevolent heart, but of weak

judgment and imperfect temper, he had not succeeded in former objects, and was not likely to succeed in this. He failed; but when we witness the actual success of the method as far as it admits of success, we must remember to whom we owe it. He expected moral reformation from a mechanical appeal to selfishness: he did not get this; but he furnished us with an effectual aid to the inducement of good habits and harmless manners. Of the true use of the mark system we shall see something presently.

We must slip over the few years of confusion which none of us are likely to forget, during which there were a dozen differing ways of administering 'the separate system,' and more ridicule, and fresh disappointments, and another Committee, with its crowd of witnesses, and, on the whole, a considerable extension of the cellular system among provincial prisons; and, finally, a forcible end to the transportation system by the refusal of the colonies to receive any more convicts. Western Australia would take three or four hundred a year; but there was no channel open now for the 3,000 and more whom we had been resolute, up to this time, in sending away.

As we must henceforth deal with our criminals at home, new legislation was necessary; and in the autumn of 1853, the first Penal Servitude Act became law. By this Act, the avowal was fairly made that we must take complete charge of our criminals; the principle of mitigation of punishment (in cases of penal servitude) by the reformation of the offender was recognised, and the country was to make a new start in its management of convicts, which it was hoped might be the last. The bad effects of irresolution and frequent change were indeed by this time abundantly evident.

The substantial merits, amidst some serious defects, of this Act have long been proved by its operation in Ireland, where it was fairly worked. In England, so many of its provisions and essential conditions have been neglected, that it has never had a chance.

The convict department in Ireland is separate from that of Great Britain; but the Penal Servitude Acts are the same in both. Before 1853, the number of convicts transported from Ireland were rarely under 1,000, and sometimes as many as 1,500. There is a notion prevalent in England that Irish crime is something singular — 'agrarian, or something odd.' The tables before us, however, show a catalogue of offences just like those of other countries, and quite as large a proportion of burglaries, and all sorts of theft, as in tables of offences elsewhere. Under the same circumstances with England, then —

with transportation suddenly stopped — the Irish authorities went to work under the new Act, taking care in the first place to work it faithfully. They did the same with the second Act; and the result is this.

The number of prisoners in Government prisons on New Year's day has diminished annually since the first Penal Servitude Act came into operation; the number being 3,933 in 1854, without reckoning several hundreds in Bermuda and Gibraltar who were returned to Ireland; whereas on the 1st of last January there were 1,314. The diminution has been continuous, as we said. At first the reduction was by five and four hundreds a year; and it is still by two hundreds and upwards. The diminution must become slower, in proportion to the genuine success of the management, as more and more of the incorrigible class will be in the gaols, as there are fewer of the improvable orders. As the Report of 1859 observes —

‘The utmost that a good system of convict treatment can accomplish is by good training, and by other appliances, to promote the improvement of, it is to be hoped, the large majority; and by arrangement and system to, as far as possible, ensure the reconviction and reincarceration of the remainder. In crime the greater part of the remainder assuredly are; and the sooner the public understands this to be the case the better. Prisons which are only half filled very generally indicate a desirable state of things; but their value must not be overestimated. If criminals have been discharged without any indication of self-improvement, that system may be considered as yet incomplete which does not materially aid in effecting their reconviction, and thus so far protect the community they would otherwise outrage.’ (P. 13.)

While incorrigible offenders are more and more certainly brought back to gaol, with longer sentences in proportion to their former transgressions; while the registers of the criminal class are more and more complete, and the police supervision is wonderfully effective; and while the cost per head of the convicts is greater than it was before 1854, Parliament is asked for 50,000*l.* a year less for Irish convicts than was required six years ago. One convict prison is ‘abolished,’ for want of inmates; and many gaol officials have been dismissed, though each convict is infinitely better attended to than formerly. Within the last six years — that is, since the establishment of Intermediate Prisons — only ten per cent. of all classes of convicts (among whom ticket-of-leave convicts form a small proportion) have come back to prison, and eighty per cent. are known to be doing well. A penal law which works to this effect must have essential merits, however much may be due to

the quality of the officers who administer it; and we know of no better way of arriving at an understanding of our melancholy case in England than by studying the different results from the operation of the same law in Ireland.

The Irish authorities are of opinion that public security requires that the entire criminal class should be known and watched; that the only means of security is in the reformation of the offender and the imprisonment of the incorrigible; by which means, united, the criminal class will be perpetually diminishing. Every convict is made to understand, after his arrival at the prison, that he can mend his condition, in one way and no other — by mending himself. The mark system does what can be done by such a method; it encourages to industry and self-denial, and thus opens the way to a better position, and further advantages, till it lands the aspirant in the Advanced Class, where marks are discontinued, because the members have something of a character to support, and have acquired a certain degree of self-respect. Thus far, there is little that is new, or that could command any great confidence in observers; but here comes in the great feature of the scheme. The officials are at least as well aware as anybody else of the untrustworthiness of any appearances of moral reform in offenders during their seclusion from the world, while they are under special religious ministrations, and have much to gain, and nothing to lose, by either pretending or fancying themselves reformed. Not only is every step proved by actual labour and achievement up to the hour of leaving the gaol, but the officials declare that no expectation can be formed of the subsequent conduct of the convicts till they have been seen working in the open air, among companions, away from the chaplain and the governor, and under a *régime* of severe toil and protracted hardship. To supply this test, the Intermediate Prison has been established — an institution which has been naturally compared to a convalescent hospital, but which is essentially unlike that other intermediate institution. In the hospital, the patients are under a system of indulgence, and use their powers by mild degrees; whereas, in the open prison, the men undergo a toil and hardship far greater than are borne by the comrades they have left in gaol, and those among whom they hope to enter again in the world.

When that re-entrance on the world takes place, they are still, to a man, under the eye of the authorities and the police. Every man of them has been photographed, is registered, and understands that his way of life will be watched. Those of them who are ticket-of-leave men are perfectly aware that any lapse

from respectability, any vicious habits, any association with known vicious persons, will infallibly cause their license to be revoked. They will come back discredited, to fulfil the remainder of their term. Under such circumstances, it is natural that the convict should be extremely anxious to obtain employment, on receiving his liberty, by means of the prison authorities, or under their cognisance. The repugnance to employ thieves was as strong in Ireland ten years ago as it is anywhere at present; but so much genuine reformation has for so long been proved, that it becomes easy to place out both men and women. Applications are made to the officials for women from the Refuge as female servants, and for men from the Intermediate Prisons as labourers, warehousemen, &c.; and the result is almost invariably good. A considerable number, however, serve and labour only till they can earn enough wherewith to emigrate; and hence the process of natural transportation of which we spoke. These humbled people cannot be free and happy after such an experience; they dread the attacks of their old comrades in crime; they cannot throw off the sense of disgrace; and they abhor the surveillance under which they live; so they save money to go to some distant land; and they are next heard of by their sending to brother or friend the means to join them.

As we have seen something lately of the spirit with which the Intermediate Prison system can be treated by objectors who have never looked into it, we may be rendering a service by quoting some remarks, under this head, of those very trustworthy inquirers, the four Visiting Justices from Yorkshire. In answer to mocking inquiries how inmates are chosen who will not run away, what bribes of vicious indulgence are offered to them to stay, and who can believe that the huts are not as bad as the hulks ever were, we quote the following comments on the establishment at Lusk. We need not apologise for the length of our extract; for no statement, in the whole literature of prison discipline, could be more interesting to us in our present crisis of perplexity and dissatisfaction with our own methods.

‘Lusk is a village about twelve miles from Dublin. Powers were obtained by Act of Parliament to enclose an open common there, previously occupied only by “squatters.” Two huts of corrugated iron, each capable of holding fifty men, were erected at a cost of 320*l.* a piece. A portion of each hut is partitioned off for a warder to sleep in, and the rest serves both as day-room and dormitory for the convicts. A cook-house, and offices of the simplest character, stand, with the huts, in an enclosure bounded by a mud wall a yard

high. A few cottages for warders, scattered about the common, complete the whole *matériel* of the "prison." All the usual features of a prison may be said — with something of the idiom of the country, though not without high English authority for the phrase — to be "conspicuous by their absence."

'As to the *personnel*, we found at the time of our visit about sixty convicts in charge of five warders. The truncheons we saw at Mountjoy have no place here, and other weapon or chain there is none.

'The obvious question to ask first is — Do not the prisoners often escape? Of more than a thousand men, we are told, who have passed through the prison, only two have attempted it.

'Is, then, the non-escape of the prisoners owing to the place being made so comfortable to them that they have no wish to leave it? We certainly fail to find any evidence of such comfort. The men sleep in hammocks in the hut, and all that one can say is, that while they are inside it, they have shelter; but the moment they leave it, they are exposed to every wind of heaven, and to all the rain of that humid climate. In point of mere physical comfort, the advantage is altogether on the side of an ordinary prison, to say nothing of a well-warmed cell at Wakefield or Pentonville. We found most of the men, at the time of our visit, working up to the middle in drains, than which few employments conduce less to comfort. The diet is stated to be not more than the medical officers consider to be necessary for the maintenance of health and fitness for the hard labour and exposure to which the men are subjected. Table E. in the Appendix shows that the diet at Lusk is lower than that at Portland, except in *potatoes*.

'The gratuity is half-a-crown a week, which is rather more than in any one stage at Portland. But it is so much lower in all the previous stages that a convict, under a four years' sentence, in Ireland, can only earn half the amount which he could earn, under a similar sentence, in England.

'The men at Lusk are allowed to spend sixpence a week of their gratuity; and we are told that many of them buy bread with it — an indication that the diet allowed to them is not excessive.

'On the whole we saw no appearance of any indulgence to induce men to remain, as they do, without physical restraint, and submit to strict discipline. . . . The bailiff, who was superintending their work, told us that, having had charge of gangs of labourers in many parts of Ireland, he had never found men more tractable or willing to work than these prisoners; adding, what would rarely be the case with free labourers, that an oath or indecent expression was unheard among them. This statement was confirmed by the other officers. It was difficult to conceive that these were men of the same class as those whose scowling or knavish visages we had seen in photograph or in flesh, in the first stage at Mountjoy; yet undoubtedly they had passed through that prison.

'How, then, are the men who are to come to the Intermediate

Prisons trained and selected? It is clear that everything must depend upon this. . . .

'The principle of selection we have in part already seen. It is this:—

'No man convicted of murder or unnatural crime ever comes to the Intermediate Prisons, nor any under sentence for life, unless the sentence be commuted. But, with these exceptions, every convict who has attained the number of marks required to work out his sentence, according to the scale described above, is admitted as a matter of right. To a certain extent, therefore, the men may be said to select themselves. With the exceptions we have mentioned, it is open to every man, by a certain amount of good conduct in the Ordinary Prisons, measured in the way described, to obtain the privilege. It appears that about 75 per cent. of the whole number of convicts do in fact obtain it; a considerable proportion of those who do not obtain it being excluded by the nature of their offence and sentence, as mentioned above, as well as by failure of health, commutation of sentence, &c.

'Of the men sentenced under the Act of 1857, taken by themselves, 80 per cent. attain the Intermediate Prisons—the remission of sentence allowed under that Act affording a stronger inducement to good conduct.

'As it has been alleged that only the least criminal class of men are admitted into the Intermediate Prisons, we ourselves carefully examined the registers, and found that, out of a hundred names taken consecutively in the register, eighty-four were those of old offenders—that is, of men who had been convicted previously to the offence for which they were sentenced to the Convict Prisons; and we were told that generally they are, for the most part, men who formerly made crime their vocation, casual offenders being the exception.

'There can be no question that the good dispositions of men, placed in a position so nearly approaching to liberty, and under such an entire absence of physical restraint, are severely tested. Some of us were inclined to doubt whether the test be not too severe; whether, especially, the association by night is prudent, considering the evils which have resulted from it under previous systems of prison management. On the other hand, we are told that not only have those evils not in fact resulted in the Intermediate Prisons—though they have now been seven years in operation, and a large number of men, amounting to 2,900. have passed through them—but that the general conduct of the men has been unexceptionable, and that not one convict has given cause of offence in them, on moral grounds. We are bound to say that we found a concurrence of testimony, from every source accessible to us, to this effect, and none to the contrary.

'It is further argued that if men are not fit to pass through such an ordeal as that of the Intermediate Prisons, still less are they fit to be exposed to the yet greater temptations of the world at large.

‘In the Intermediate Prisons the restraint is reduced to a *minimum*, and thereby the test of character increased to a *maximum*. That great evils have occurred elsewhere, among men placed in association, under somewhat similar circumstances—but without a similar previous training—proves the severity of the test, and also proves the want of such training. That they have *not* occurred in the Irish Intermediate Prisons proves the excellent effect of such a training, *à fortiori*, from the proved severity of the test.’ (Pp. 35–43.)

The success with the women is at least as remarkable as that with the men. The readers of ‘Female Life in Prison,’ aware what criminal women are, will understand the significance of the fact that the Refuges, which are the intermediate prisons of the women, are applied to as furnishing good domestic servants; and their credit in this way seems to rise from year to year.

The commonest objection to the Irish Convict system is, that the released prisoners repair to England, whereas very few English go to Ireland. The statistical facts settle this question. When eighty per cent. are known to do well, and ten per cent. are recommitted in Ireland, no very great number can remain to enter English gaols. As we have seen, the total number of criminals who were in the hands of the police in 1861, was 148,972, of whom 2,718 were added to the convicts in the gaols. The proportion of Irish to English committed for every sort of offence was 16,000 to 87,000, the rest being made up of Welsh, Scotch and foreign offenders. When we consider that, of the 87,000 English, and of all the Irish, Welsh, Scotch and foreign, under 3,000 became convicts; and when we consider the large colonies of low Irish settled in all our chief ports and manufacturing towns, and the numbers employed in agriculture, and moreover the prevalence of drunkenness and fighting and wife-beating among the low Irish in the towns, we shall see that it is not possible that more than a very small number can have become transferred from Irish to English gaols for serious offences.

The fact of the success of the Irish method (which is simply that of a full and faithful application of the existing law), is, as far as we know, undisputed. There is no question of the truth of the story; as indeed there can be none, while crime is decreasing, the prisons are being closed, and prison officers dismissed, and the expenses lessening, while more and more of the worst professional ruffians are in durance. The excuse for our failures in England, therefore, is that the Irish system is not practicable here. Such is not the opinion of the conductors of the Irish experiment; and it must be remembered that Sir

Walter Crofton not only asserted the Irish experiment to be practicable when most people regarded it as a philanthropic craze, but foretold, several years ago, that we in England should in due course have a 'dominant' criminal class to deal with, and be perplexed and embarrassed exactly as we are now.

Still, however, we encounter the supreme difficulty — in Ireland, as everywhere else — what to do with the dregs of the criminal class, — with the utterly depraved and incorrigible. We have seen that the very worst offenders are never admitted to the Intermediate Prisons at all. With regard to these, then, the solution remains to be found.

The operation of the first Penal Servitude Act is one of the saddest spectacles that the whole story presents. While the convicts in durance were awaiting the decision of their fate, on the sudden arrest of transportation, they were mutinous, and society was in peril. Transportation had become very popular among them; they had considered it a settled right of their own to be carried out to the colonies, after going through a certain term of labour on public works at home; and when they learned that they were not to go, they believed themselves deprived of a chance at the gold-diggings, or at least of liberty and prosperity in a flourishing country. There were above 7,000 of them actually under sentence, — or as they regarded it, under promise — of transportation; and the demands and discontents of such a body of criminals were a serious embarrassment to the Government. What Government did first, was to send as many as possible to the one colony which remained open; but in doing this, there was a breach of faith with Western Australia. The new Bill made penal servitude, or labour on public works, at once a substitute for transportation under shorter terms (seven and fourteen years) and the middle one of three degrees of punishment, of which the lightest was imprisonment, in which the feeble-bodied were necessarily included: and thus, the colony was burdened, contrary to agreement, with the worst and the weakest classes of convicts, while the able-bodied and corrigible were kept at home. This was one mischief.

There was another which caused a much louder outcry here. The Act provided that, at the time when the sentenced convicts were to have been sent to the colonies, they should be set free at home with tickets-of-leave. This was done in a way precisely opposite to that which was adopted in Ireland. None of the conditions which were printed at the back of the ticket were observed: the released prisoner had his fare paid home, where

he was sure to be in the midst of his old bad companions : no measures were taken to have him watched, or in any way reminded of his liabilities : he was to be hurried out of sight as fast as possible, in order (as we were told) that he might be free to obtain honest employment through the ignorance of employers that any taint attached to him. We all remember what followed. The released convicts seemed to turn up everywhere, for it was their obvious policy to leave their old neighbourhood as soon as they had got their post-office orders cashed for the half of the gratuities due to them on leaving prison. In a new district they could begin a fresh career ; and if they were caught, they had a good chance of a light punishment, from their being supposed new to crime. As at present, the increase of robbery and garotting was ascribed to the maligned ticket-of-leave ; every discharged convict was assumed to be a ticket-of-leave man ; and the exaggeration of their numbers by the popular imagination was enormous. The occasional swarms from the hulks were forgotten -- swarms of ruffians whose sentences had been shortened by one-half or less. The tens of thousands annually discharged from the infamous old gaols, which were schools of crime, were overlooked ; and the panic fastened upon the five thousand ticket-of-leave men and women, whom the law assumed to be under the surveillance of the police.

In 1855, one consequence of this panic appeared. It was announced, on the authority of the Convict Prison Directors, that the sentences of penal servitude under the Act must be fulfilled without any remission whatever. It is understood that the judges were as much astounded as the convicts at this declaration, as they had passed long sentences under the supposition that the terms were to be shortened, as in the transportation and ticket-of-leave cases up to that time. The idea was, evidently, that this proceeding would extinguish the license system ; and in its place, a provision was made for the convicts employed on public works rising, by good behaviour, through three gradations of privilege above the lowest at which they entered. This was despised as a substitute for the power of obtaining freedom ; and the aspect of affairs was so threatening, that in the session of 1856, the whole matter had to be gone over again. From January to July of that session, committees of both Lords and Commons collected evidence, on which they briefly reported, when it was too late to pass any measure that year.

As we have already observed, there was a strong bias in both committees in favour of transportation. The Lords undertook

this head of the inquiry ; and their conclusion is given in the seventh paragraph of their report. ' That, however, in the opinion of the Committee, among existing colonies, that of Western Australia seems to offer the only field for the continuance of the system of transportation ; '—the following paragraphs being occupied with a condemnation of the change by which convicts sentenced to more than fourteen years were inflicted upon the colony. The final paragraph recommends a revision of the Penal Servitude Act, by which shorter terms of such a penalty were substituted for transportation.

The Commons Committee wished there could be convict prisons in remote countries, where sentences could be carried out, and then proceeded to state its conclusions on the penal servitude question. It approved of a fixed term of imprisonment and hard labour, followed by a period which the convict could abridge by good conduct ; and it alleged that bad consequences had ensued from the recent extinction of this hope. But it was indispensable that the terms should be as long as those of transportation had been, the existing sentences serving for the fixed term. A shorter sentence of penal servitude seemed to the Committee to be needed, to make a proper gradation ; the hulks were finally condemned as intolerable, and the ticket-of-leave system was declared to be too new to afford materials for a decisive judgment. Four paragraphs follow, however, very favourable to the principle of release on license. They declare the principle to be sound ; regret the misapprehensions then prevalent—instances of which appeared in the witnesses before the Committee, who had confounded together all released convicts as ticket-of-leave men ;—and insist on the fulfilment of the conditions of leave, and the thorough surveillance of these wards of justice. They declare the conduct of a large proportion of the licensed men to have been good, and reject the plea for neglect of them, that surveillance would deprive them of a chance of work—observing that licensed and freely discharged convicts are under the same conditions as to getting employment, except that the released on leave have established the rudiments of a good character. Finally, a method of full communication between all parties charged with public security was recommended ; the police should always know where to find released convicts ; and the Home Office should have a clear understanding with the judges and the magistracy of the kingdom.

The important points of this Report are—its admission of the principle of the convict's power over his own destiny, to a certain fixed extent ; and its virtual condemnation of the prac-

tice of shortening sentences. It would restore the former terms of punishment, and would introduce one of penal servitude for three years to fill up the gap which would thus be caused. This Report has been heartily adopted and acted upon in Ireland; it has been treated with neglect or worse in England; and we see the consequence in the actual condition of public security in Dublin and London.

The Second Penal Servitude Act was brought forward early in the next session. It adopted the main recommendations of the Commons Committee Report; but the Home Secretary did not commit himself freely to the principle of his own measure. He would permit only a shorter remission of punishment, and would then discharge the prisoner unconditionally, except in some peculiar cases. Misled by the sentimental objection that the poor fellows would not get work if the police were looking after them, he would have the police *not* look after them. We need not point out that this was a surrender of the only safeguard that society can have, and an equalising of the licensed prisoner with the ordinary discharged felon, except in as far as 'good conduct' in prison had earned a small remission of punishment. Now, 'good conduct' in prison is known by all experienced officials to be worth absolutely nothing as a test of reformation. The Irish officials themselves say that a better judgment can be formed of the real state of mind of a convict by a few days' observation when he is at liberty, than by any number of years under any degree of restraint. Moreover, it appears that in our English gaols, 'good conduct' is so generally the rule, that 80 per cent. of the men, and 84 per cent. of the women never commit any offence whatever in gaol. However numerous may be the transgressions reported, they are always the work of a very small number of prisoners — insubordinate from weakness of intellect or perverseness of temper.

The clearest view of the changes introduced by the Act of 1857 may be conveyed by an extract from Sir George Grey's Circular to the Judges and Magistrates on the Bill becoming law.

•
'The following are the principal alterations in the law made by this Act:—

'1st. It extends the provisions of the Act above-mentioned of the 16th and 17th years of Her Majesty by substituting in all cases the sentence of penal servitude for the sentence of transportation.

'2ndly. It extends the terms of penal servitude so as to make them correspond in duration with the terms of transportation to which convicts might formerly have been sentenced.

‘ 3rdly. It gives a power to pass sentences of penal servitude of a shorter duration than the former *minimum* term of transportation, but of not less than three years.

‘ 4thly. It attaches to the sentence of penal servitude the liability of the convict to be removed while under sentence from this country to a colony, there to be dealt with in all respects as if he had been sentenced to transportation.

‘ The second and third of these alterations have been made in accordance with the recommendation of a committee of the House of Commons appointed in 1856, to inquire into the provisions and operation of the Act 16 & 17 Vict. c. 99.

‘ The last, and most important of them, will enable the Government to avail itself, to the fullest extent, of facilities which may from time to time exist for removing to a penal settlement abroad convicts sentenced to penal servitude. . . .

‘ As a considerable discretion has therefore been left in the hands of the Executive Government as to the manner in which such sentences are to be carried into effect, I feel it right to inform you of the general rules which it is proposed to adopt with regard to prisoners on whom the sentence of penal servitude will hereafter be passed.’

The tabular statement which follows this circular in the Report of the Prison Directors (p. 22.) must have conveyed to the magistracy of the country a strong impression of the uncertainty of the amount of punishment for crime henceforth. The Table might be got by heart by the authorities (as it is always and easily by convicts), and the conditions might be regarded as fixed, and the punishment certain, if any security could be obtained for a thorough understanding among the ministers of justice all over the country, a constant surveillance over discharged prisoners, and a steady application of the law to new and old offenders; but in the absence of such safeguards, and while transportation was still discussed, as a thing which might become feasible again, through some accident or other; and while the public were disputing with the authorities as to whether crime was on the increase or the contrary—a doubtful matter under the increase of summary convictions which took place at that date—the total impression on the minds of the public and of the criminal class was that crime was rapidly on the increase, and that punishment was becoming at once more lenient and more variable.

From that time to this there has been an incessant conflict of opinion between the public, the Directors in England, and the Directors in Ireland about the working of the Act; but the real subject of controversy is not the Act, but our ‘convict system,’ which is something very unlike the law. The enlargement of summary jurisdiction is complained of as intro-

ducing large numbers to the evil influences of a gaol for short periods, while magisterial sentences are of such inequality as to make the administration of justice ridiculous: and the tribunal itself is one which the criminal class complain of as unjust. This is almost the only attention which the public gives to any class of offenders but the ticket-of-leave men. When convicts are spoken of, anywhere outside a prison, they are always ticket-of-leave men; and complaints of leniency always refer to the use of the license. It is quite true that there is much to complain of in the administration of the law; but if it was carried out as well in Great Britain as it is in Ireland, there would still be much to consider in regard to the far larger number of culprits who are not under terms of license at all.

At the end of five years from the passage of the Act, we find ourselves all of one mind as to 'the failure of our convict system'—all of us, except a very few enthusiastic officials, who now, however, admit that there is no great wisdom in enacting a law with clear and stringent safeguards, and then, in practice, dropping out the safeguards altogether. At the back of every ticket-of-leave the conditions of the license are printed; and the holder is warned that he may be brought back to fulfil his term of punishment, not only for a fresh breach of the laws, but for an idle mode of life and disreputable connexions. Every man of the class knows very well that these conditions are never attended to. He gets what he can of the 'gratuities' he has obtained by the conduct to which he owes his ticket, and then, if he is a shrewd man, burns his ticket. It was galling to him, in leaving the prison, to be looked down upon by the fellows who had fulfilled their sentence, and who boasted that they were completely free; and he puts himself on an equality with them as soon as possible. He believes that he is making a fresh start, with a new name in a new place; he is confident that no eyes are upon his mode of life; and that if caught in a fresh offence he has every chance of passing for a new offender—not only because he has been lost sight of since his release, but because the Secretary of State has thought fit to diminish the allowance for the expenses of witnesses at distant Courts, and it is pretty certain that his old acquaintance among the police will excuse themselves from the trouble and cost of taking a journey to identify him. The passion for economy in managing the department of crime—that economy which we are every day calling 'penny wise and pound foolish'—that economy which impairs the management of our female prisons, and wears out and kills off matrons by imposing twice as much labour on them as woman's frame can

bear; — that economy has taken a bad direction in inflicting loss on witnesses for the public service of identifying old offenders; and it is one of the evils which we are bound to protest against.

It was discovered, four years since, that some abuses had been perpetrated by witnesses who got a profit out of their attendance at trials of supposed old offenders. Such abuses are of serious consequence, of course, to the man on his trial, to the Court, and to the public purse; but the proposed remedy is working so badly that something must be done. The tariff framed by the Government is now so low as to frustrate justice to a great extent. Poor men will not prosecute; policemen and others who have no spare means discourage prosecutions, and are apt to deny all knowledge of an old acquaintance, or to profess a total loss of memory about events which it would be costly to remember. The police on the spot find all manner of obstruction in investigating a case of offence, because every poor person who could give information dreads being bound over by the magistrates to attend at the trial. On police witnesses the burden is particularly heavy, from the frequency with which their evidence is wanted; and it has lately become known that their friends among the authorities interfere on their behalf, to prevent their being summoned. The Recorder of Birmingham says, in the appendix to a late charge—

‘I have been informed by the local authorities of Birmingham that the governor of the gaol in a neighbouring county wrote to them to request them not to require the attendance of his officers, as the poor men really could not afford the loss imposed on them by their journeys. It is but reasonable to suppose that the feeling which prompted this extraordinary request is shared by many who have too little frankness, or too much prudence to avow it.’

A vigorous presentment of this evil by the Grand Jury of South Lancashire, in August 1860, was understood to have produced sufficient sensation in the Home Office to incline the Minister to improve the scale of allowances; but it was to be at the expense of the local rates; and thus again a temptation would be offered to screen or ignore offences. The general judgment on the case seems to be that, if it can scarcely be hoped by any method, or any scale of allowance, to secure a perfect correspondence between crime and justice, any error should be on the side of over zeal rather than concealment of transgressions.

Photography supplies a new and valuable method of detection. If we had the necessary complement of the license system, a perfect system of communication between all the

magistrates and their police throughout the kingdom, and a registration of offenders, with such a supervision as is the actual but unfulfilled condition of the ticket-of-leave, we should have something like the command over our criminal class which 'the system' is assumed to give us.

The main desideratum, however, is of a different kind—the Intermediate Prison. Having spoken fully of this institution in connexion with Ireland, we will here only refer our readers to the experience and example of the Prisoners' Aid Society, and of such refuges for female convicts as have successfully served the purpose of intermediate prisons.

From details we must here pass (very briefly) to some general principles. It is necessary, in the first place, to admit what is, indeed, nothing but a truism—that the only possible security for society is in the reformation of its criminals. The only question which can be raised here is as to the proportion which may be rendered harmless. Till the greater number are so neutralised, the criminal class will remain 'dominant.' Reformation, to any extent whatever, requires that offenders should be dealt with individually. Without this, nothing more than conformity—and a very transitory conformity—can be obtained. Sir Joshua Jebb admits that female convicts require this individual treatment, but insists that men should be treated *en masse*. The truth probably is that, in regard to the discipline of the gaol and the prosecution of the labour of the men, management by drill, and organisation in masses is best; but with this there should always be, and doubtless may always easily be, individual application, by means of the chaplain, if of nobody else. Sir Walter Crofton, who has succeeded as no other man has ever succeeded, emphatically declares his conviction that his method is as practicable in England as it has proved in Ireland; and in this he is sustained by the object proposed, and the provisions made, and the openings left by the Act of 1857.

If the objection is to the cost, in trouble and money, the question occurs whether any possible expenditure of public money and public effort in working an effective system can rival that to which we are now submitting, under the dominance of our criminal class. When we, like the Irish directors, can reclaim eighty per cent. of our convicts, and keep a due control over them, and find our gaols half empty, and our prison officers too many for their work, while convictions correspond closely with offences, we shall find ourselves more lightly taxed for crime and justice than we have ever been yet. As matters stand, there is something unspeakably painful in

meeting, in our gaols, instances of hard economy in small matters, and of timidity about laying out money in ways absolutely requisite, while 'the system' is subjecting us to an expenditure which any nation would refuse, except as a supposed ransom of life and property. It is well understood that our reformatories are saving us from a vast tribute to the criminal class. A larger economy still would be achieved by a faithful and strict working of the law of penal servitude.

Next, the present outcry about the dietary of our state prisons is altogether a mistake; and we must assert the principle that bodily health is one of the requisites to moral reformation. The mass of letters about the high feeding of our Government convicts which appeared in the newspapers before Christmas was a national disgrace to us. Those letters showed at once a wonderful ignorance of the physiological case, and a shockingly low tone of moral feeling. People who print their notions for the public benefit should understand what they are talking about; but these complainants are ignorant of the effect of low feeding on the brain. The effect is to depress the reason and excite the fancy: to embitter the temper and exasperate the passions. As the imprisonment itself has something of the same effect, till it is relieved by hopeful toil, a satisfying diet is necessary to sustain health of body, and create that of mind. One or two remonstrants have condescended to compare the diet of the Government invalid prisons with that of the free labourer. It is stooping very far to compare the dinner of the imprisoned convict with that of the free labourer at Portland; but to take Dartmoor and Woking, in which the decrepid and sickly are deposited, for such a comparison, is an unworthy trick. In all such comparisons, the proposers seem to forget that the true English citizen prefers a 'dinner of herbs,' with family love, and personal innocence and honour, to the 'stalled ox,' in the abode of disgrace, amidst vile companionship. If the free labourer at Portland dines on bread and cheese, it is because there are wife and children at home, whom he has the privilege of supporting; and the notion that a free and honest citizen would commit crime to get into durance, where he could have six or ten ounces of boiled meat and a pound of potatoes for dinner, is to insult every good man in England. We may trust that it will do no harm to the convicts, either. No; our true economy does not lie in the direction of underfeeding men who are already suffering under a change of life as great as their brain can bear. Their treatment is arranged under the advice of physicians; and we

trust the aim will continue to be, not to make them eat little, but work much and well.

It is a popular error to suppose that sentimental prisoners' friends are always trying to get sentences shortened. As far as we have been able to observe, the constant importunity of our successful managers has been for a lengthening of sentences, in the great majority of cases. This leads us to consider the crowd of prisoners in our gaols, and aggressors in our streets.

The shortening of sentences wherever possible is one of the chief characteristics of our criminal management of late years; and nothing could be more foolish or mischievous. It is bad economy, though economy is the excuse; and it fills the gaols which it was intended to empty. The present panic has wrought in the direction of lengthening the sentences of old offenders; and we may hope that there will be permanent re-arrangement of terms of punishment.

The Criminal Justice Act is a great blessing for the quantity of business it enables us to get through with the lighter order of offenders; but it is a very serious evil that old offenders, men and women, who have been convicted three, six, or ten times, should pass the tribunal on the same terms with those who have transgressed slightly and for the first time. As nine-tenths of the sinners who pass through the hands of the police are dealt with summarily, the number of old convicts brought up for slight offences must be considerable; and their sentences are almost always proportioned to the single act, and not affected by their depraved and dangerous character. Any certainty of recognition would be a great security to society, and a heavy blow to the confident members of the criminal class.

Something more than this, however, seems to be considered necessary for duly affecting the imagination of garotters and burglars. For our part, we have a clear persuasion of the necessity of flogging for such cases. We have no sympathy with the vindictive feeling which expresses itself in clamour for bread and water, the cat-o'-ninetails, and any other infliction that can be devised in our period of society; but we certainly believe that applications of punishment must vary with the capacity and habits of the offender. There can be no doubt that the most experienced managers of reformatory methods are right when they say that the deterring power of punishment is very limited; and that when the limit is passed, further infliction only increases crime. It is on this ground that the present cry for vindictive and cumulative punishment

is highly dangerous. But it is also unquestionable that the most deterrent punishment compatible with humanity is the most humane, because the most effectual. Flogging is sincerely and undisguisedly dreaded by the most hardened, impudent, and brutal criminals. They can feel the disgrace of it after they are lost to every other touch of shame; and the pain of it is within the capacity of their imagination, when the sufferings of a protracted penal servitude seem dim and remote to them. The proper class to flog is that of perpetrators of crimes of personal violence. That sort of crime is so easy, for the most part so safe at the moment, and so gratifying to the passions of brutal men, that a sharp and dreaded penalty is particularly needed for its repression. Flogging might be used with advantage in some other cases if we cannot gain the point of longer sentences. We must have something effectual in the place of an infinity of short imprisonments which introduce a constant succession of novices to the interior of our prisons, allow no time for reform, and send out a crowd of disgraced persons into the world, more likely to break the laws than before they were punished.

While our 'system' is conducted on Sir J. Jebb's idea that 'due observance of routine duties will commonly effect all that can be done for convicts,' we shall suffer as we are suffering now. There will be a constant accession to the number of the criminal class, without reform of the older members. It is in entire consistency with this leading idea of his that Sir J. Jebb prefers soldiers, or men of the soldierly stamp, for prison officials, that the 'routine' may be as strict and perfect as possible. We are warranted in distrusting this view of the case, not only by the bad success of 'the system' thus far, but by the fact that in Ireland, where 'routine' fills its proper place, and not the whole field of experiment, and where the prison officers are selected for intelligence and education, as well as moral qualities, the convicts work much harder for much less external inducement than any English convicts. They undergo more hardship, more toil, and a severer probation in every way than our gaol-birds; and the consequence is on the one hand the reform of four-fifths of the offenders, and on the other the perpetual reduction of the criminal class.

We are told that nobody has the courage to propose the expenditure which would be necessary to deal in the best way with our convicts. Let any good man-of-business in Parliament present the account of what we now pay for 'dominant' crime, and what would be requisite for getting and keeping it under, and we shall see whether the people of England will not be

willing to pay, and indeed be delighted to see how the cost will diminish from year to year. It would be a cheap bargain for the country to keep prisoners for longer sentences; to give them (especially the women) a fuller staff of guardians; to establish and maintain an effectual correspondence between the magistracy and police of the kingdom, and a registration and supervision of the criminal class generally, and discharged convicts in particular; and, finally, to have special prisons for the seclusion of incorrigible offenders. Such prisons at home would be much less costly than they could be in the Colonies, even if the way were open which is in fact closed for ever. It is due to public security at home that the utterly hopeless class should be sequestered; and it is due to the new and rising societies of the Colonies that they should be spared all risk of any repetition of the evils which they have thrown off, and now peremptorily refuse to be subjected to in any degree, and on any pretence whatever. About such perpetual sequestration there ought to be no scruple whatever in relation to the great majority of the worst class of all. We are too apt to disregard or forget the fact that a large proportion of our worst criminals are half idiots. Perhaps some of us have never heard how hopelessly weak-minded many of them are. Having scarcely any understanding and no power of will, they cannot reform. They are made up of animal passions; and it is a mere mockery and cruelty to all parties to sentence such beings to one imprisonment after another, and let them out to commit another crime on the first opportunity. If these wretches, and the thoroughly depraved and hardened, who have proved themselves to be of an incorrigible quality, were secluded, at any cost, it would be a cheap bargain to even the existing generation, while the next would be grateful to us for having delivered them from the burden and curse of a 'dominant' criminal class.

The measure adopted by the Government to allay the indignation and alarm caused by the increasing insecurity of the metropolis, of Edinburgh, and of several other large towns, is the appointment of a Royal Commission to consider the subject. The names of the commissioners are, no doubt, calculated to inspire respect. They comprise two ex-Lord Chancellors, three or four ex-Secretaries of State, and other persons of eminence. We are especially gratified to see the name of Lord Grey at the head of it, for no statesman has taken sounder views of the question. But we must be permitted to ask, what discoveries can this Commission be expected to make? what unknown remedies can it attempt to apply? There is nothing in the power of this or any other commission, which the Secretary of

State for the Home Department is not already empowered and bound to do. Commissions are deservedly regarded with suspicion, when they are employed to divide and weaken the responsibility of a Minister. The administration of criminal justice — by which we mean the carrying into full and efficient execution penal sentences pronounced by courts of justice in the name of the law — is, in this country, by far the most important duty of the Home Secretary. In most other internal matters Great Britain governs herself; but for the restraint of criminals the strong hand of executive power is indispensable. We owe it to truth and to the public interest to say, that for several years past these most important duties have been ill discharged. We know not if it be due to the weakness or indifference of the heads of the department, or to the pedantry of their official subordinates, but the result is deplorable. The effects of this laxity in encouraging the criminal population of England to attempt new kinds of crime, and to revive old offences long since out of date, are but too apparent. The uncertainty which is allowed to attend almost every species of punishment has powerfully lessened its deterrent efficacy; and with regard to the highest penalty of the law, we do not hesitate to assert that it would be better to abolish capital punishment altogether, than to inflict it, or commute it, by the sole pleasure of the Secretary of State. The cases of Dr. Smethurst and Mrs. McLachlan, and some others of recent date, are an opprobrium to the justice of the country — the more so, as it is notorious that the decision of the Home Office was in direct opposition to the strong opinion of the judges who tried these criminals. Is it supposed that these learned and exemplary judges wrongfully condemned these miscreants to die? If not, we cannot but regard the interposition of the Secretary of State as an unwarrantable interference with the law; and we ask, who are to be executed, if these are reprieved? *Si nocens absolvitur, judex damnatur.*

Of all the remedies to be applied to the present state of things, we take the most essential to be such a change in the criminal law as would give greater precision and certainty to punishment; and when the sentence of the law has been duly ascertained and passed, there are very few instances indeed in which the executive authority of the Home Office ought to be permitted to modify it.

ART. IX.—*Executive Power*. By B. R. CURTIS, late Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States. Boston: 1862.

A CONSIDERABLE time has, it must be confessed, elapsed since we have taken occasion to review the political condition of the country, or to engage in the controversies of domestic politics. But, in truth, whilst the events occurring abroad, in both parts of the world, during the last two or three years, have to an unusual degree fixed our attention on the progress of Italian freedom and independence and on the calamitous disruption of the American Union, England has enjoyed a temporary exemption from those party contests which are tainted with personal predilections and interests, and from those questions which touch the fluctuating balance and distribution of power. The veteran statesman who holds with undiminished vigour the helm of government at an age at which no man before him ever led the debates of the House of Commons, may indisputably claim the character of a national minister. Whatever opinion may be entertained of his policy on particular questions—from whichever side of the House of Commons he may be regarded—it is evident that Lord Palmerston has to a great degree outlived the distinctions of party. In this respect he has attained a position resembling that of the Duke of Wellington in the later years of his life. The present Government is strong and efficient—not that it can boast of any large and preponderating majority in Parliament, on disputed questions or on party votes, but because on all really great and practical subjects it has the confidence of the nation at large, and even of those who are the natural critics and antagonists of its policy. On these questions it may fairly be said that the policy of the Government is the policy of the nation itself. The more public affairs are swayed by public discussions which appeal to reason and to the principles of political science, the more it may be hoped that concord will spring from conviction. Passion and prejudice are the main incentives of party. Over opinions which originate in these sources, truth itself has no hold. But the surest test of an advanced state of civilisation and freedom is the disposition of a nation to refer its controversies to fixed principles, and to decide them by progressive reasoning. We think, therefore, that the prevailing unanimity of the country at the present time, on most of the leading questions of public policy, is not due only to some lucky accident, still less to languor or apathy, but rather to the progress which has been made in political

knowledge, and to the general conviction that as the career of improvement is never closed, the natural play of our institutions and the steady flow of public opinion afford us the best means of pursuing it.

It appears, therefore, to us to be the height of error and injustice to confound this state of comparative or apparent repose with stagnation and obstruction. On the contrary, this state of things is the result of the successful termination of the numerous reforms which have been accomplished in the last thirty years. Little would it redound to the credit of parliaments and statesmen if the same work had already to be done over again. It is a false estimate of the strength and rapidity of our national progress to measure it only by the magnitude or the tenacity of the obstacles to be overcome. Liberal principles can boast of no greater triumph than the fact that the obstacles which once opposed an almost invincible barrier to their ascendancy, have now, for the most part, disappeared; and that even the minority does homage to the majority by affecting to adopt the same objects and almost the same methods of government. Good government means the exercise of political power according to a high standard of morality and knowledge, with a far deeper regard for the welfare of the ruled than for that of the ruler, of the subject than of the sovereign; with a wise discernment of the true conditions of national progress; and with a nice regard to the rights of others in our international relations. In a perfectly well-ordered community (if such a state of things be attainable by man), that administration would have most reason to rely on the support of a free people which should come nearest to such a standard.

It cannot be denied that organic changes in the State, and violent party contests, however necessary they may be at certain times, tend to suspend the ordinary functions of government. Men's minds are absorbed by exaggerated fears or hopes of the immediate object before them. Means preponderate over ends. The time and attention of Parliament and of public men is devoted exclusively to the struggle; and whatever be the ultimate result, the action of the Executive Power is for the time impaired and interrupted. It is not while the mechanism of the State is under repair that the engine can put forth all its power, or the vessel attain its greatest velocity. True national progress ought, on the contrary, to proceed with the greatest swiftness and success when the march of affairs is not distracted by constitutional questions or by fierce ministerial conflicts. Then, if ever, is the time when we may expect of the Executive Power an undivided and enlightened attention to the great interests of

the commonwealth at home and abroad. A train moving swiftly along lines of well-adjusted rails advances so steadily that its rate of progression is almost imperceptible except by watching the apparent flight of external objects. Nay, the motion of the globe we inhabit, though infinitely more rapid than that of the most powerful mechanism, is totally unperceived by the inhabitants of the earth, until they measure it by the other celestial bodies. The people of this country, enjoying within their own borders a singular degree of tranquillity and concord, might imagine that they were standing still, if they looked not beyond their own firesides; but if they watch the condition of other nations, and the manner in which the infinitely complex relations of this great empire are carried on, in perfect freedom and in perfect order, they will be led to acknowledge that the political constitution under which they have the happiness to live is the masterpiece of man, capable of leading us ever in the van of civilisation and of liberty.

If, therefore, we dismiss those party controversies which have lost something of their interest at the present time, it is because the people at large, as well as their political chiefs in either camp, are engrossed by larger and more general questions, in which the distinctions of party are forgotten or thrown aside. Differences of opinion of course exist on all such questions, but they are differences which have little in common with our old party distinctions; and it may be said that these subjects are now discussed on their merits both in Parliament and by the press, to a degree not common in any former period of our social history. We assert, then, with confidence that, although the present Administration has not been encouraged by the temper of the country or by its own supporters to attempt great measures of organic reform, no Government has ever had more important duties to discharge, or more decisions to take on questions of such gravity that a mistake would have been disastrous to the public interest. Let us here briefly enumerate them, before we proceed to examine some of these topics with greater detail. The defence of the country was, in the first place, to be provided for. Financial resources, unknown at any former period of peace, were to be raised without undue pressure on any class. The Government of India, just recovering from the most violent convulsion which had ever befallen a British dependency, was to be transformed, and the military, political, and judicial institutions of an empire to be remodelled. A judicious and temperate influence was never more needed in the affairs of the Church. Questions of

maritime law of great delicacy have more than once arisen from the application of extreme belligerent rights to vessels sailing under the protection of our flag; and the whole subject of neutral rights and interests has acquired from the American blockade an intense importance to this country. From the same cause an unprecedented calamity has struck down to the earth one of our chief branches of industry, and reduced a vast and meritorious population to sudden destitution. In our foreign relations, a good understanding is to be maintained with the enigmatical ruler of France—a task not always easy, from the fluctuations of his policy, but necessary to the preservation of that understanding between the two greatest nations of the world, which is the guarantee of peace, and an incalculable blessing to both of them. In the South of Europe, the independence and union of a new kingdom, in which the people of England feel a strong and disinterested sympathy, are to be supported without compromising the principle of non-intervention. In the North of Europe, an auspicious marriage is about to unite the heir of the Crown of England to a daughter of the future King of Denmark, and we are more than ever interested in the maintenance of the just rights of the Danish monarchy: nor can we believe that the British Government has intentionally departed from any of the principles which have regulated its policy in the Danish question for the last fifteen years. In the East, the bloodless revolution of Greece has again opened questions affecting the whole Christian population of Eastern Europe; and the conduct of the Greeks in this conjuncture has been such as powerfully to bespeak the interest of the British people. Above all, in the Western Hemisphere we are watching from day to day the progress of the most extraordinary political revolution and the most sanguinary war of the century—not only with the sympathy and sorrow due to the misfortunes of both sections of this free and cognate people, but also with the knowledge that many grave interests of our own are at stake; and that if the war is not speedily brought to a close, the recognition of the Confederate States by the European Powers will be urged with increasing claims to their attention.

These are all matters of the highest importance and difficulty. They are not only what may be commonly called political questions, they are statesmen's questions; they all require to be handled with consummate sagacity and forbearance. Every step to be taken in them by the Government must be justified on strict principles of reasoning. They are too momentous to be abandoned to the chances of party warfare. They are in fact *national*, not *party* questions; and although different views may

be entertained as to the best mode of dealing with them, these differences have nothing in common with party politics.

In this sense, then, we shall now proceed to consider those subjects which appear to have the most prominent claim on the attention of the legislature, during the session of Parliament which is about to commence.

The most striking example of the national spirit of the present day, contrasted with the party spirit of former times, is to be found in, what indeed is a purely national object, the measures taken for the defence of the country. The most important and effectual of these measures is, beyond all comparison, the spontaneous formation of the Volunteer army, which has in a short space of time supplied precisely the description of force best adapted to the protection of these islands from invasion and outrage. The Government of the day can claim but a secondary merit in this great work — nor could any government interference have brought it to pass; for it arose at once from the hearts of the people. Without distinction of political opinions, of class, of rank, or of employment throughout Britain — townsmen and countrymen, nobles and artisans, lawyers and peasants, swelled the array of these self-created troops. To the credit of the Volunteers themselves, and to the honour of those who have directed this great movement, it has never been so much as asked to what party in the State this or that man belongs. The reproach commonly addressed to civic armies is, that they retain too much of their civic character, and that the passions of political life are thus transported into the ranks. That is the cause which has frequently rendered the National Guards of continental states so fatal to the interests they were designed to serve. In the Volunteers of Great Britain no such disposition has anywhere, or in the slightest degree, manifested itself. The same loyalty, the same absolute obedience to the law, the same attachment to the institutions of the country, pervades the whole Volunteer army, as is to be found in the regular forces raised and paid by the State; indeed these qualities may be said to exist among the Volunteers to a still higher degree, for they are the very principles which have called them into being.

But, simple and spontaneous as this movement is, the fact is not the less extraordinary and unprecedented, from the entire absence of State control, and the wise abstinence of the Executive Power. It implies a degree of confidence never before shown by a government in an equal degree, to place arms without restriction in the hands of 100,000 men, and to encourage the formation of a popular army outnumbering the regular forces

of the Crown in this country. Yet such is the reliance placed by men of all parties on the good sense and fidelity of the people at large, that it has probably never crossed the mind of any English statesman, that inconvenience could arise from these voluntary levies, or that any political distinction could be drawn between one class of forces and another.

The Government has thus far only been called upon to afford a slight and indirect assistance to the movement. But it has wisely been referred to a well-constituted Royal Commission to consider the means required to give this important element of our defences the strength and permanence of a national institution. The Report of this Commission is already before the public, and we presume that the War Department will call on Parliament to give effect to its recommendations. A comparatively small sum of public money, judiciously applied, and proportioned to the effective strength of the corps, will suffice to relieve the Volunteers from those inevitable charges which cannot in reason be thrown upon men who already give so much of their time and energy to the public, and which ought not to assume the shape of appeals to private generosity. The Volunteers have an ample claim to be relieved from such expenses; but, on the other hand, there is an obvious limit to the assistance they can safely accept from the State, since every pound of public money must be administered under the responsibility of the Government, and, as far as it goes, under official control. The independence, which is the life of Volunteer organisation, requires that the assistance of Parliament should be so limited as not to interfere with the essential conditions of the present system.

Whilst the patriotic spirit of the nation has thus supplied what was wanting to the personal defence of the country, and created a force which could be converted in a very short time into a highly efficient defensive army, the Government have not been slow to prosecute those vast and costly works which can only be carried on by large Parliamentary grants and by the authority of the State. The creation of an iron-plated fleet, and the fortification of the naval arsenals, are two of the most considerable undertakings in which this country has ever engaged for the purposes of war. The difficulty of conducting these works with success is greatly increased by the unsettled state of the whole science of attack and of resistance. Experiments have demonstrated that an iron-plated ship is more than a match for any number of wooden vessels, and consequently that a fleet of such vessels might be swept from the seas by a small squadron of iron-plated frigates. But

experiment also warrants the belief that guns may be made and projectiles invented, against which no armour is impenetrable. The Admiralty has therefore been compelled to build iron-plated ships, although it is by no means certain that they will prove permanently successful. We entirely acquit the present Board of Admiralty of any want of zeal or of intelligence, although, from the nature of the case, their course has often seemed irresolute and contradictory; but we retain the opinion we have more than once expressed before, that many of these evils would have been avoided, if a thorough administrative reform had been effected in the department itself.

We have never shared the apprehension of foreign invasion which has been frequently expressed, and which some of our contemporaries have contributed to inflame. On the contrary, we do not believe that this most difficult and formidable undertaking is seriously contemplated by any foreign Power, or that any foreign Power has the means of attempting it, as long as the British navy is in its normal condition, and the population of Britain trained to the use of arms. The only consideration which could tempt any foreign enemy of this country to such an enterprise would be the belief that we had neglected our natural means of resisting it. If anything were wanting to complete the impracticability of an attempt to land a powerful army, with its artillery and material of war, on the shores of this country, it is the invention of iron-plated ships. Wooden vessels, which could alone be employed as transports, are at the mercy of iron rams and plated gun-boats. An action at sea between such unequal combatants would end, not in partial damage, but in the total destruction of the weaker vessel; and we have seen in the American war, that the mere suspicion of the presence of a 'Merrimac' may stop the communications of a whole army. We think, therefore, that the fear of invasion would not be reasonable even in time of war with a powerful enemy; but in time of peace, by way of surprise, we hold it to be a bugbear which does not merit the honour of serious discussion.

With this conviction, we cannot give our unqualified assent to the enormous fortifications now in course of construction round our principal arsenals; and there is a strange inconsistency in the employment of so many millions for this purpose, whilst our dockyards are so deficient in their internal accommodation, that we have only two or three docks or basins available for the largest class of modern vessels. That some defences were urgently required we readily admit, more especially those which may be required to repel attack from the sea. The old sea batteries and their armaments were totally

inefficient. But the principle adopted in the coast lines and citadels now traced around Plymouth and Portsmouth is, that these towns are to be defended, like Sebastopol, from a warlike fleet and army sufficiently numerous to invest and attack them by sea and land—an hypothesis which we regard as eminently improbable; for if England were so reduced in power as to suffer such an aggression, she would not find safety behind these walls. For all practical and necessary purposes, we are convinced that adequate means of defence for the dockyards and arsenals might have been obtained without the enormous works and expenditure now in progress; and we must add that the existence of such works on points commanding the dockyards may become a positive danger, unless they are permanently occupied by an amount of military force which is not consistent with our present establishments. Mr. Pitt attempted to fortify the heights of Tregantle, which command Whitsand Bay—a most important point where a vast citadel now crowns the cliff—when he was at the height of his power, and the country was just engaging in a tremendous war. He was beaten by the casting vote of the Speaker in the House of Commons, and the scheme was abandoned. Of all the permanent marks of the ascendancy which Lord Palmerston has acquired and exercised over Parliament, his own colleagues, and the country, none will be more surprising to posterity than the prodigious fortifications on which upwards of ten millions sterling will ere long have been expended.

These questions of national defence are of primary importance, not only from their direct effect on the security of the country, but from their indirect effect on the public expenditure. We are raising and spending an income entirely unprecedented in time of peace, and not far short of the greatest financial efforts required of us in war.* The excess must be set down almost entirely to two causes—the magnitude and novelty of the changes recently introduced in our naval and military armaments, and the uncertainty which hangs over our relations with some foreign countries. We have ceased to feel the

* The army and navy expenditure stands thus:—

	Army.	Navy.	Total.
1857 . .	£13,443,235	£9,305,973	£22,749,208
1860 . .	15,312,675	12,836,100	28,148,775
1862 . .	16,060,350	11,794,305	27,854,655

But about one million must be deducted from the military expenditure of 1862, for charges incurred in India, and repaid out of the Indian revenue.

slightest confidence in what is sometimes called the exceptional character of this expenditure; because experience shows that in the complicated affairs of this great empire, there is always some unforeseen cause of extraordinary outlay, and the real exception to the common rule would be the absence of such an occurrence. Cape wars and China wars, a mutiny in India, or an armed demonstration in some part of the world, are for ever occurring to baffle the hopes and belie the promises of successive Chancellors of the Exchequer; and it is hard to say, when, in the present state of the world, we shall be able to revert to a true peace establishment. We do not conceive, therefore, that any considerable reduction can be effected in the personal strength of the army and navy; and we should view with regret any diminution of the rank and file of one service, or the seamen of the other. In point of fact, that is not the way in which economy can best be practised. The reduction of a whole battalion saves the country only 40,000*l.*; and nothing is more possible than that troops disbanded one year may have to be raised at an increased expense in the next. But we have strong reasons to hope that, in other departments of the military and naval expenditure, considerable retrenchment may be introduced, without at all impairing the efficiency of the service. One of the largest items of our recent expenditure has been the manufacture of new guns and stores of war; those stores are now so ample, that the demand is for the present supplied. So, too, in the navy; although the expenses of building iron-plated ships are very great, the adoption of the new system relieves us from some portion of the outlay which was continually going on in the fitting and repair of wooden vessels.

There is another point in connexion with this subject on which this country may fairly and justly claim a considerable reduction at no very distant period. We allude to the expenses incurred for the military establishments in the Colonies. This question has already been ably presented to Parliament by Mr. Arthur Mills and Mr. Adderley.* It has been considered by a select committee, and it is steadily gaining ground in public opinion. We do not agree with Mr. Goldwin Smith, that the time is come to abandon the Colonies to their fate, or to withdraw the garrisons from the Mediterranean fortresses; but we think it perfectly consistent with justice and

* See the new edition of Mr. Adderley's 'Letter to Mr. Disraeli on the Present Relations of England with her Colonies.' October, 1862. See also for further details on this subject an article in this Journal. (Ed. Rev. vol. cxv. p. 104.)

good policy that if the Colonies, properly so called, desire to have the protection of a certain amount of troops from the mother country, the whole expense should be borne by the colonial treasuries, and not by the English people. This is the principle acted upon in India; and we see no reason whatever that it should be less applicable to the North American, South African, West Indian, or Australian dependencies of the Crown.

It is now distinctly established that we maintain troops in the British Colonies, not for our own benefit, but for theirs; yet the cost of the defence, and even in part that of the internal police, of these territories, is paid for out of our pockets. It is time that this state of things should cease; but as it may in many cases be more economical to maintain a small and efficient British force in a colony than to throw the people on their own defensive resources, we think that the option should be given them of obtaining from England a certain number of troops, upon undertaking to pay the whole cost of the force as long as it remains on colonial duty. But it should also be made a condition, *sine quâ non*, that the colony do also maintain at least an equivalent force of indigenous troops. To the naval protection of this country the Colonies are clearly entitled, without any cost to themselves, because our naval power derives great advantages from the colonial stations in all parts of the globe. In the event of colonies refusing to tax themselves for the maintenance of the troops, we do not hesitate to say that they ought gradually to be withdrawn. The total annual cost of the military defence of the British dependencies (exclusive of India) in 1859-60 was three millions and a half sterling; of this sum about 300,000*l.* were borne by the Colonies themselves, or rather less than one-tenth. Twelve hundred thousand pounds may fairly be charged on this country for Gibraltar, Malta, and the Ionian Isles, garrisoned by us for imperial purposes. There remains, therefore, a direct outlay of two millions, which should either be borne by the Colonies themselves or stopped altogether. This suggestion is the most practical mode we can discover of reducing materially the war estimates. It is desirable, for the sake of the Colonies as well as for our own, that, if they aspire to retain their proud position as members of the British Empire under the protection of the British flag, they should contribute to the cost of defending it, as far as they are themselves concerned; and, having now conceded to them all the rights of self-government, it is obvious that the advantages they derive from their connexion with England are incalculably greater

and more important to them than the nominal possession of a semi-independent province or island can be to us.

There is one consideration arising out of our present financial condition, which cannot be adverted to without satisfaction and astonishment. We mean the remarkable readiness with which this enormous revenue is raised in all parts of the country not suffering from acute local distress; and the fact that even the disastrous effects of the American revolution have been counter-balanced by the results of the commercial treaty with France, and by the general prosperity of the country. The Return of the National Income for the past year establishes the fact, that without any additional taxation the revenue has increased by the enormous sum of 2,392,578*l.*; and that in spite of the losses to the country arising from the American war, the general result is one of rapidly increasing prosperity.

Nevertheless, of all the questions which concern the internal condition of the country, by far the most urgent and the most perplexing is that raised by the destitution of the population habitually employed in the cotton manufacture. Other matters may await the course of events or the gradual solvent of public opinion; but in this case the suffering is direct, the need is patent, and, whatever else may be said or done, British benevolence has not waited to be told twice that there are tens of thousands of our countrymen who, by no fault of their own, are reduced to excessive indigence, and who are looking for public assistance to enable them to live. It is impossible to exaggerate the patience, the heroism, the noble independence, and the grateful sense of mutual kindness which this severe trial has called forth in the suffering population of the manufacturing towns afflicted by this calamity; and we esteem not less highly the moral energy, the touching zeal, the unanimity of feeling, which have led all classes in the country to unite for the purposes of charitable relief. On both sides these qualities have shone with conspicuous lustre; and perhaps, in the eye of faith or of philosophy, these moral triumphs outweigh the material sufferings by which they are called forth.

But it is the duty of the politician to consider these facts in relation to their causes and to their consequences; and, further, to determine what share can be taken by the State in lessening evils which press so severely on large masses of the population, and act so injuriously on the general interests of the community.

No doubt the total interruption of the supply of American cotton has been the immediate cause of the suspension of the cotton manufacture; but it is by no means the only cause. If there were at this moment a demand for manufactured

cotton goods, at such advanced prices as would cover the increased cost of the raw material, that material is not altogether wanting. There are even now about 430,000 bales of cotton for sale in open market at Liverpool; a certain quantity exists at Southampton and some other ports; private stocks, to an extent which we cannot determine, are still held by many manufacturers; indeed, considerable quantities of raw cotton are still sold and exported every week to the Continent. Why, then, are so many mills closed? The reason is obvious. About eighteen months ago, at the commencement of this crisis, the markets of the world were literally encumbered with Manchester goods. Had a sale been forced, they would not have fetched a tenth of their value, perhaps not of their cost. So large was the stock on hand that it has sufficed to supply the whole demand of the world for nearly two years with no very great augmentation of price. These goods were manufactured with cheap cotton; it is evidently impossible that goods manufactured from dear cotton should compete with them in price, at least until the supply is extremely contracted. Yet, from the enormous profits which were made in Lancashire and Cheshire in the last few years, and down to the eve of this very catastrophe, there was a rapid increase in the capital, the population, and the enterprise engaged in the cotton manufacture.* Even now, in this interval of time, which ought to teach these men a different lesson, we are told on good authority that fresh mills are being built, to take advantage of the first return of prosperity, and many of the cotton towns have shown great disinclination to resort to emigration or other means of reducing their starving population, because they anticipate that they will, ere long, again want 'all their hands.' Hence their efforts have been directed to keep this dense population about them, even as paupers, until they can again be employed.†

* The population of Lancashire has increased in the following manner:—

1801.— 673,846
 1811.— 828,499
 1821.—1,052,948
 1831.—1,336,854
 1841.—1,667,054
 1851.—2,031,236
 1861.—2,429,440

In other words, the decennial rate of increase in Lancashire has varied from 20 to 27 per cent., whilst the average of increase in the United Kingdom is from 12 to 18 per cent.

† In 1851 the cotton mills of the United Kingdom are said to have employed 470,317 persons, of whom 222,612 were male and 247,705 females. In 1856 the following figures were exhibited:—Cotton mills, 2,210; children employed, 24,684; young persons

We entirely dissent from these views: we believe them to originate in a false estimate of the causes and the consequences of this misfortune; and it is evident that, to apply the true remedy, a correct notion must be formed of the nature of the disease.

In the case of a famine, or scarcity of food, like that which decimated Ireland in 1847, the difficulty may to a considerable extent be overcome by money; because, though the food of the people may be entirely deficient in one country, it can be obtained for payment in another—thus, in Ireland, Indian corn was substituted for the potato. Moreover, in dealing with famine, you may calculate with confidence that the return of harvest will in due time replenish the exhausted stores. The whole problem in Ireland, therefore—and that was not a small one—consisted in finding the means of feeding the people for a given number of months, weeks, or days. In the Irish famine, a Parliamentary grant was resorted to, in addition to the private munificence of the nation. At one time, about three millions of daily rations of food were distributed. The measure was necessary, and it was wise; though in its application it did not escape those abuses which are inseparable from public donations. It may be added that, in Ireland, the Poor Law was of very recent introduction, and, as the payment of rent had ceased, no rates could, in many places, be levied at all.

But the present case is totally dissimilar. All the gold in the Bank of England will not, as long as this war lasts in America, materially augment the quantity of cotton, nor (what is even more important) enable the manufacturer to bring his cotton goods into the market at remunerative prices. To bring about that change which will set the mills going again, we can look to absolutely nothing but the natural operation of the laws of trade; and any artificial interference with them will

and adults, 354,565: total mill hands, 379,249, of whom 222,027 were females. According to this statement, which we borrow from that most useful work the 'English Cyclopædia' (Art. Cotton Trade), the number of hands employed in the cotton manufacture would seem to have diminished between 1851 and 1856—a thing not improbable, from the rise which was taking place in the price of the raw material. The tables of the employments of the people under the Census of 1861 are not yet completed. We are informed, however, that the population of cotton-workers is now 472,519, of whom, in December, 236,379 were out of employment, 159,074 working short time, and 77,066 in full work. The actual unemployed population is, therefore, about one-tenth of the entire population of Lancashire.


probably defeat its own object. There is but little reason to suppose that the American war is about to end; or that, if it did end, cotton would immediately be obtained from the South in unlimited quantities; or that, if it were obtained in unlimited quantities, the cotton manufacture would be at once restored to the condition it was in down to 1861. Mr. Cobden spoke the strict truth when he said, on the authority of an eminent Liverpool merchant, that he expected five years to elapse before the cotton manufacture is restored to its former prosperity. We entirely concur in this opinion; with this addition, that five years stand, in truth, for an indefinite period, and that, to men destitute of the means of subsistence, it is an eternity. All the efforts now made for the relief of the suffering classes in Lancashire and Cheshire assume that the evil is to be of limited duration, and that, if these quarter of a million of hands can be kept alive for twenty or thirty weeks, all will be well. They are, consequently, to be maintained in comparative inactivity until the tide turns and rises to the necessary height. Nay, one of the most zealous promoters of the Relief Fund informs us that it is necessary these persons should be kept in idleness, lest their hands should lose the delicacy of touch required in the cotton manufacture.

We must again express our dissent from this view of the case. The inordinate scale to which the cotton manufacture was carried, the high rate of wages, and the attractions of independence to every sex and age, had applied a high pressure to the population, and drawn vast multitudes of persons, especially young women, to this species of occupation. But the system was in the highest degree artificial, depending not only on the supply of a foreign commodity, but also on foreign markets, and on the wisdom of those by whom the trade was carried on. It has now met with a terrible revulsion; and though we deeply lament the sufferings by which all such changes are brought about, we are satisfied that the only true and effectual remedy for the evil is the gradual transfusion of a considerable portion of the population heretofore employed on cotton manufactures to other employments, or by emigration to other parts of the country and to the colonies. The interruption of the cotton trade has, of course, given an immense impulse to other manufactures, especially those of woollen goods, linen, and jute; and we have no doubt that ingenuity, stimulated by necessity, will, ere long, supply in other forms much of that employment which is at present wanting. To this end we think the exertions of those who would permanently benefit the manufacturing population should mainly be directed.

Much also may be expected from the increased supplies of East Indian cotton, but until the price of the raw article is greatly reduced, the mills cannot be reopened with any chance of success. Indeed the problem is one of a very complex nature. The present disparity between the price of raw cotton and of manufactured cotton goods cannot, of course, last: the one must fall or the other must rise, as soon as the stocks on hand are sold off. But if the price of the raw material is such as to raise the price of manufactured goods three or fourfold, there is an end of that cheapness which stimulates the demand, and English cotton goods would be sold and used abroad in much smaller quantities; on the other hand, if circumstances caused a marked fall in the price of raw cotton, the supply from India would decline. This last contingency, however, is extremely improbable; for we are satisfied that even if peace were restored in America at once, there is no large quantity of cotton to be sent to Europe, and that whilst the war lasts the production of cotton is comparatively abandoned for the production of food. The greater probability is, that when peace is re-established, there will, for some time, be no cotton to send.

But in the meantime, what is to be done with nearly half a million of mouths requiring food, and deprived of all the necessaries of life? That they must be provided for, during the present winter, nobody doubts: the question is, by what means? The sources of relief in such a case are these: the local rates, public voluntary contributions, and a Parliamentary grant.

Large as the amount of destitution unhappily is, we see no reason to suppose that the existing poor-law, aided, but not overwhelmed, by private beneficence, was or is inadequate to meet it: and we must say that everything leads to the conclusion that a temporary rate, however large, could nowhere fall with more justice, or with less severity, than on these counties. It is admitted that the vast population which now crowds their towns, and in many parts converts whole districts, once rural, into a continuous suburb, has been brought there from all the adjacent country to work the cotton mills. It is certain that enormous fortunes have been accumulated there, and that a very large portion of the money so accumulated has been invested in building fresh mills, to increase the power of production. These structures have, throughout the county, given an exceptional value to land; and even the agricultural interest has been largely, though indirectly, benefited by the vast demand for dairy produce and meat. The wealth of Lancashire and Cheshire has increased more rapidly, and is now greater, than the wealth of any other part of England of equal extent, ex-



cepting — perhaps not excepting — the metropolitan district. Many of the chief resources of these counties are even now untouched, though the cotton trade is in abeyance. From the inquiries we have been able to make, the commerce of the port of Liverpool was never more flourishing in spite of the Morrill Tariff and the American war; and it would be a gross error to suppose that even these counties are exclusively or even mainly dependent on the cotton interest. It is a most striking and astonishing fact, that in these opulent districts, in whose name the most urgent appeals for relief have been addressed not only to their own fellow citizens, but to the distant dependencies of the empire, and to foreign nations, there were still on the 1st of September last, *three millions and three quarters of pounds sterling* in the local savings banks, and that this enormous sum represented the disposable funds of the operatives and small tradespeople. The whole excess drawn out in the preceding year of distress did not amount to 10 per cent. on this sum. We say nothing of the funds invested in Building Funds and other associated property: but we must add that there is reason to believe that very large sums are held by the managing committees of the Trades' Unions, which are reserved for the emergencies of strikes, and have not been touched in the present distress of the manufacturing population. It is certain that the rating of Lancashire and Cheshire to the poor has hitherto been far below the average of the kingdom, and immeasurably below that of many of the rural districts. Add to this, that the unions are invested with a power of borrowing, under Mr. Villiers' Act of last session, when their rates reached a certain height — this power has been very scantily exercised. Nor have the boards of guardians availed themselves of the power conferred by the same Act to take a rate in aid from the county, when their own rates had reached 5s. in the pound. We say, therefore, that the system of poor-law relief, by the regular institutions of the country, has not had a fair trial; and one of the causes which have tended to conceal the true state of the case is the voluntary interference of the Relief Committees, by which charitable assistance has been temporarily administered on a more liberal scale, and without the conditions which the Poor Law imposes. The consequence is that the legal action of the boards of guardians has been superseded; the suffering population has been taught to look to other quarters for unconditional assistance; the rates have been kept down; and, in some instances, the operatives have refused work when offered them.

Nothing can be further from our intention than to under-

value the moral advantages of voluntary charitable contributions, and we doubt not that the spirit of sympathy in the giver, and of gratitude in the receiver, doubles the value of the gift. But viewed on strict principles of public economy, national subscriptions and collections are liable to many objections. They serve in some degree to perpetuate the evil they are designed to remedy. They are open to great abuses in the distribution of relief. They divert the stream of charity, which must needs be always required by the objects of a man's personal and domestic bounty, to purposes remote from home. They impose a tax of mercy on the generous and the good, from which the parsimonious and the churlish escape scot-free. Lastly, it may be hard to say whether the rate-receiver or the rate-payer is most benefited by this voluntary rate in aid; for if it relieves the former from distress, it relieves the latter from a legal obligation and a moral duty.

If we were dealing with some momentary emergency, it might be met by private liberality; but this scarcity of cotton is a calamity of many months, probably of some years' duration. It is impossible that the large streams of charity now poured into the hands of the relief committees can be kept up indefinitely; and when this great national effort is exhausted, or required in some other direction, the result will be that a still larger pauperised population will be thrown upon the rates, and that great discontent will arise from the introduction of that labour test which ought to be inseparable from public relief. The public have come forward with the noblest feelings and intentions, and in some instances their exertions have been judiciously directed; but we are very much afraid that the Relief Committees distributing money will be found, if this distress lasts, to have aggravated the evil.

From some of these objections a Parliamentary grant must be acknowledged to be free: it is more equitable since every one contributes to it, and it is more likely to be administered with strict economy; but on all other accounts it is open to tenfold objections. Certainly, it is not a little remarkable that Mr. Cobden should have carried his sympathy with the manufacturing interest to such a length as to advocate a national vote for the relief of the most opulent class in the whole country, who are suffering from some eighteen months' suspended labour; when, in fact, the previous high rates, which wages of the operatives, and the enormous profits of the masters, and the superior intelligence of which they boast, it is continually boasting, ought to enable them to live on the branches of much better and much longer than any other body in America.

the country. Indeed we have remarked, with extreme surprise and regret, that the men who had been foremost in the successful advocacy of sound doctrines of political economy, when they told in favour of the manufacturing population, have not scrupled to encourage and disseminate the most mischievous errors during the present crisis. Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright know perfectly well that no good can be done by setting at nought the great laws which govern the trade and industry of mankind. Their attempts to change the course of events by artificial expedients are as foolish as the devices of protection, and will only injure those they mean to befriend. We presume that this is one of the subjects to which the attention of Parliament will speedily be called, if not by the Government, at least by the representatives of the manufacturing counties; and we readily admit that from the magnitude and the peculiar causes of the calamity, it deserves the fullest and most liberal consideration. But when it is remembered through what trials other branches of the populations have passed at different times—the silk trade of Spitalfields and Coventry, the agricultural labourers of the West of England, and numerous other examples might be quoted—without any claim for a measure of national relief, we are confident that Parliament will not be led to abandon the sound principle in this case. If a million of money be required, a million might, without difficulty and without injustice, be borrowed on the security of the rates of those great counties. But the effective remedies to which we chiefly look are of a different nature. We hope that a considerable portion of the mere cotton-spinning population will, if this suspension lasts, be absorbed in other employments—that other branches of industry may be introduced in Lancashire—that many of these families may be transferred elsewhere—that some will emigrate*,—and that the general prosperity of the country, which has not suffered so much as might have been expected by the interruption of the cotton trade†, will gradually compensate for the ruin this one interest has sustained.

* The number of emigrants from the United Kingdom to the United States and to the British Colonies, which had risen in 1852 to 368,764, fell in 1861 to 91,770, or about one-fourth! The British Colonies could, with ease and advantage to themselves, receive the quarter of a million of persons who now burden the poor-rates of Lancashire; and, as far as the young women and children are concerned, they would emigrate without the slightest disadvantage to this country or to themselves.

† It appears, from the monthly returns of trade published by the

Occurrences like this powerfully remind us how precarious, after all, is the tenure of the prosperity based on the complicated structure of modern society. Change but one of the conditions of our daily life, and a million of men may starve. The export of a pod from a certain portion of America is stopped, and a dozen towns of Lancashire are desolate. So it was, but from natural causes, that a potato blight decimated the population of Ireland, and changed the face of the land; an aphid, brought to light in a grape-house at Clapham, spread over the habitable globe, and for years destroyed the fruit of the vine; an epidemic seized upon the worm which spins our silk, and the rich towns of Lombardy were impoverished, the weavers of the costly tissues of Lyons were beggared. If a coccus were some day to appear in an ear of wheat, an immense fraction of the human race might perish. These are the visitations, mysterious and destructive as the plagues of Egypt, which from time to time arrest the growth of population and of wealth. War alone, when it rages with the ferocity now displayed in the United States, may undo the work of a century. And it is impossible not to recognise, in the course of human affairs, the irregular but not less certain recurrence of causes which belie and confound the unlimited pretensions of human progress. With puerile complacency, President Lincoln has sought in his recent message to Congress, to turn attention from the miseries of the present to the splendid prospect of two hundred millions of free American citizens, covering, in the next century, the Western continent with wealth, knowledge, and freedom. Alas! does not this Alnaschar of the West perceive that at this very moment, causes are in active operation which will set bounds to these dreams, and which may, before the present century is completed, depopulate the most fertile regions of the globe!

We now approach the most important and the most critical portion of this survey of public affairs—the foreign relations of the country, and the condition of several of those foreign

Board of Trade, that the total exports of the first ten months of last year were 103,519,269*l.*, against 105,480,242*l.* in the corresponding months of 1861, showing a decrease of less than 1½th per cent., and of about 8 per cent. below the exports of 1860, which was the most prosperous year on record. Considering what the effect of the American war has been, not only on the cotton trade, but on our whole commercial relations with the United States, it is most satisfactory to find that we have gained in other branches of foreign trade almost as much as we have lost in North America.

States by which our own interests are most powerfully affected. Peace indeed exists throughout Europe, and between England and all the other nations of the globe. Nor do we share the apprehensions of those who believe that this peace is likely to be soon or lightly disturbed. But it is an armed peace—a peace maintained by armaments as vast, by an expenditure as profuse, as has been caused in other times by the efforts of war. We look in vain for that confidence in the written law of Europe, and in the known intentions of foreign Cabinets, which enabled the statesmen of England for many years to speak of war as a distant and improbable contingency, and to reduce the military and naval establishments of the country to a footing scarcely compatible with the public safety. Throughout all classes of society the conviction exists that our own security and influence now require of us a greater display of material strength. We submit to the cost without complaint. But we cannot be blind to the fact that these burdens are imposed upon the people of this country, solely and entirely by the unsettled aspect of foreign nations. We are reminded every day that events occurring abroad, over which we have little or no control, do in fact control to a considerable extent the internal condition of England. The present Administration, in presence of these great difficulties, has held a high, an independent, and a prudent course. Without firing a shot, it has caused the influence of England to be felt and respected abroad, and it has contributed to the progress of freedom and good government. Without incurring the direct hostility of any European Power, it has frequently opposed and moderated the dangerous designs of others. On this ground, also, Lord Palmerston has had the advantage of representing not a party, but the immense majority of the nation; and the prudence and skill which Lord Russell has thrown into those foreign questions to which he has given his unbiassed attention, have contributed in the highest degree to support the present Cabinet. The present moment is not unfavourable to the consideration of the general principles on which the foreign policy of the Government may be said to rest.

The Crimean war was an epoch in the affairs of Europe, more important from the indirect results it has produced on the relations of the Great Powers, than for the valour of Inkermann or the fall of Sebastopol. From 1815 to 1854, the alliance of the Northern Courts remained unbroken, almost undisturbed. On all the great questions which successively arose in the varied course of public affairs—from the Congress of Vienna to the Congress of Verona, in presence of the revolutions of France,

of Belgium, of Poland, of Italy, in opposition to the liberal dynasties of Spain and of Portugal, down to the great convulsion of 1848 and the war in Hungary, the Courts of Vienna, Berlin, and St. Petersburg might be regarded as one Triple Power, swayed during the whole reign of the Emperor Nicholas by the despotic will and the military pretensions of the Russian Czar. The natural result of this compact Northern League was the creation of an antagonistic alliance in Western Europe, of which England and France were the most conspicuous members: well would it have been for the dynasty of Louis-Philippe, and for constitutional France, if she had adhered with more firmness and constancy to these principles! The war which broke out in the spring of 1854 changed this state of things. Russia, which had arrogantly invaded the Danubian provinces of Turkey, found herself without an ally; and the next two years demonstrated that the material resources of that large empire were utterly unable to resist the intelligent and energetic forces of the two most advanced States in Europe. Austria, sufficiently ungrateful to abandon her former friend, but not sufficiently bold to declare for the cause she secretly approved, fluctuated to the end of the war. Prussia, more openly subservient to Russia, stood aloof, but had the unspeakable meanness to sue for admission to the antechamber of the Paris Congress. The result of the war was that Russia was paralysed, Austria enfeebled, Prussia disgraced. From that moment there were no more Five Great Powers in Europe, peers in strength and influence. The Northern Courts, as they were termed, had fallen into the second rank, and from that rank subsequent events have not raised them. The Emperor Alexander II. continues his meritorious exertions to repair the losses of the empire, to free all classes of his subjects, to introduce salutary reforms into the judicature and the Administration, and to promote the internal improvement of his dominions: we heartily wish him success, but these great and arduous tasks have absorbed the whole strength of his government. Austria has since undergone a great military defeat in Italy, followed by the loss of a province; and her political battles are still to be fought within her own territories; at the same time, she has entered with courage and sincerity on the practice of representative institutions, to which the state of society in that empire is perhaps better adapted than it is in any other continental State. Of Prussia, we shall only say that she has ceased to inspire fear to her enemies or confidence to her friends; and the rest of Germany is in a state of hopeless confusion. Not one of these once powerful States is at present

in a condition to exert any decisive outward influence over the affairs of Europe.

What they have lost in preponderating influence and strength, France and England have gained. There is no longer any relation of equality, or even of parity, between the actual power of the Western and of the Eastern monarchies. France has an army, incomparably more numerous, more efficient, better equipped than that of any other continental Power; and, moreover, she has learned from the Crimean and the Italian campaigns the transcendent advantage to be derived in war from a large steam navy acting in support of armies in the field. Peace with England secures to her that advantage. These most formidable instruments of warfare by land and sea are wielded by the irresponsible will of one man—secret, uncertain, impenetrable in his designs—disposing of unlimited national wealth—master of the concentrated force of 36,000,000 of people. We are bound to say, in speaking of the Emperor Napoleon III., that when we contrast the mischief he might have done to Europe with the habitual moderation of the course he has pursued, he may fairly lay claim, like Lord Clive on his return from Bengal, to the credit of great forbearance. But this moderation is doubtless attributable, in no small degree, to his wise resolution to avoid the blunders which destroyed his uncle, and to maintain amicable relations with England.

Without affecting unduly to interfere in the affairs of continental Europe, we believe that there has seldom been a period at which England has rendered greater services to the Continent than she has done in the last few years. Peace is the price she sets upon her friendship; whilst her example demonstrates that infinitely greater increase in power and wealth may be obtained by the removal of mistaken obstructions and bad laws, than by the most successful wars. Yet, at the same time, the lesson of the Crimean war has not been lost upon us. The army has been re-organised, the whole character of the military profession raised, the artillery renewed, the navy reconstructed twice over, and the forces of the country placed on a footing which they never were on before, except at the termination of a successful war. In this condition, prepared for any contingency, but resolved to neglect nothing which tends to the preservation of peace, England exercises over the whole continent of Europe that species of influence which has sometimes been described as the ideal of her power. She has, strictly speaking, no allies; she courts and professes no system of alliances; she aims at no party ascendancy in foreign States; she acts, where she acts at all, from a distance rather than on the spot, by radiation rather

than by contact. Yet, wherever there is a people jealous of its ancient independence or of its newborn freedom—from Italy, recently united under one sovereign—from Greece, just entering upon a new, and we hope a more glorious, period of self-government—from Austria, where the representatives of the people are for the first time enrolled in the ranks of the legislature—from Russia herself, in the work of emancipation and commercial progress—arms are extended towards this country in friendship and in confidence. The more we have had the good sense to abstain from that interference in the politics of other States, which led to nothing but irritation, recrimination, and aversion, the more our true national influence has grown. The principle of non-intervention has been at least as serviceable to ourselves as it has been to others; and wherever it has been scrupulously observed, we have nothing to regret or to complain of. The policy, and the successful policy, of the present Administration in its foreign relations, appears to us to be to stand aloof as much as possible from the internal affairs of foreign countries—to oppose all interference in those affairs by others—to avoid all close alliances—and to aim at an indirect, rather than a direct, influence on other nations. If, in any instance, this golden rule has been departed from, a blunder has been committed.

France has, in several parts of the world, shown a disposition to assume a more active part than is consistent with the present policy of this country. The Emperor appears to think it to his advantage to act a strong and conspicuous part as the arbiter of the affairs of foreign nations. On this principle he keeps his army in Rome; he has just despatched a powerful army to Mexico; he has even proposed to mediate in the American contest. We do not think these measures wise, and we do not participate in them; but we view them without the slightest jealousy. France will one day learn, as we have learned by long experience, that ingratitude is regarded as a virtue by nations. The greatest services of a foreign benefactor are galling to national pride, and hang like an incubus over the government which has accepted them; they are generally repaid in curses to the government which has proffered them.

This sentiment has proved fatal to the Rattazzi Cabinet at Turin; and it is quite in the usual order of things that a very strong feeling should prevail among the Italians against the principal author of their territorial unity and their national independence. With regard to the French occupation of Rome, the grievance is greater than the hardship—the affront more stinging than the injury. We have never ourselves supposed

that Rome is really the most suitable capital for the Italian kingdom, or that the French Emperor has any intention of withdrawing his garrison from it. Italy, like Japan, must for the present accept a spiritual and a temporal sovereign—a Mikado and a Tycoon—in different parts of the same peninsula. At the same time we remark that the tenacious adherence of the Pope to the temporal power he has in reality lost, is undermining his spiritual influence over the Italian clergy, and will probably terminate in open schism. The true interests of the Italian nation are far more deeply concerned in the sound practice of parliamentary government, in the revision of their defective parliamentary regulations, in the consolidation of a competent ministry, and in the adjustment of the expenditure of the country to its resources, than in the addition of another city or province to the kingdom. Italy, we are convinced, runs no danger from without, and would be even more secure if she were less warlike; but her friends cannot always feel the same degree of confidence in her internal security and peace.

With at least equal interest this country regards the progress of the revolution which has recently taken place in Greece. The Greek race, which can claim barely forty years of existence as an independent State, has displayed a degree of vigour and intelligence which justifies, in spite of all that has been said to the contrary, the confidence of its early friends. It is not the fault of the Greeks if the Protecting Powers thought fit in their wisdom to impose upon the young kingdom a sovereign of such rare incapacity, that Greece has been making rapid progress everywhere but in Athens. Her enterprising sons have covered the Levant with their ships and the globe with their commercial houses. Greek communities, of great intelligence and growing wealth, have sprung up in Vienna, Marseilles, London, Manchester, Bombay, Sydney, and New York. The Greek people has become almost as parasitical in its habits as the Jews; but with this difference, that the Greeks settled abroad are only the offsets of a great race which preponderates in Eastern Europe—the faithful adherents of a Church which in the worst of times has been the ark of their salvation—and the descendants of an empire which four centuries of Turkish conquest have not obliterated from human memory. There is, we confidently assert, no plea that can be urged to excite our sympathy for the liberty and unity of Italy, which does not speak an hundredfold in favour of the liberty and unity of Greece. The late sovereigns of Italy were detested chiefly because they were foreigners and despotic rulers. The sove-

reign who still rules over the greater portion of the Greek people is divided from them by the whole abyss between barbarism and civilisation, between Mohammedanism and Christianity, between the East and the West, between a state sinking in progressive decrepitude and a people rising by invincible steps to regain its position in the world and in history. Can any policy be more inconsistent than that which at once denounces the maintenance of the temporal power of the Pope by a French army, whilst it lends the influence of England to maintain at Constantinople the most barbarous and oppressive power which pollutes the soil of Europe? But not all the strength of the two mightiest States in the world will much prolong the existence of the two great impostures of modern history. Italy will inherit the dominion of the one; Greece the dominion of the other.

One of the mistakes made at the time of the emancipation of the Greek kingdom from the Turkish yoke consisted in the exclusion from the new State of many of the most important Greek islands. King Leopold based his refusal of the crown on the omission of Crete. He was perfectly right. The seafaring and trading population of the isles can alone apply the necessary counterpoise to the turbulent highlanders of Thrace and Maina. It is, to some extent, in the power of the British Government to remedy this evil by the surrender of the Protectorate of the Septinsular Republic and the annexation of those fine islands to the Kingdom of Greece: and we learn with the utmost satisfaction, that no sooner did it appear that the Crown of Greece might devolve on a competent ruler, than a proposal was made by the Cabinet of London to relinquish this trust, if the consent of the inhabitants, of the Greek Government, and of the other parties to the Treaty of Paris can be obtained to this change. As far as this country is concerned, we look with unmixed satisfaction on this enlightened measure, but we shall not be surprised to find that the proposed cession is received with very different feelings by those who have been most clamorous to regain their national independence. These islands form no part of the Queen's dominions. They cost this country nearly 300,000*l.* a year, without any corresponding advantage; and, although we may conceive that we have conferred some benefits on the native population, it is not the less true that our rule is unpopular. The islands were handed over to England in 1814, because it was difficult at the time to know what to do with them. Had Greece then been free, they would, of course, have been given to her, and included in the neutrality which extends over her other territories. As military or naval

positions, Corfu alone has any value at all; and Corfu is not worth to this country what it would cost in time of war to defend it. But we do not rest the cession of the Ionian Isles to Greece on this narrow ground. There is a far nobler, and, we think, stronger, argument in behalf of it. We mean the signal example, to be given by one of the greatest empires of the world, of respect for the national will of a small but free people, and the proof that when England thinks it wise and generous to surrender any portion of her rights, she rises superior to that vulgar greed of territory, which is unworthy of her greatness. The protectorate of the Ionian Isles, supported by military force, is an anomaly and a blot in our political system; and, by restoring those islands to the nation to which they belong, we have it in our power to confer a lasting benefit on them, and to do credit to ourselves.

The Greeks have given an honourable and a touching proof of their respect for this country by the unanimous and spontaneous choice of the second son of Queen Victoria to fill their vacant throne. They could not know, as we know, that the future Duke of York has public duties to fulfil in this country, from which we should be most unwilling to release him; and that, if he or his children adopted the Greek religion, they would be excluded by the Act of Settlement from the throne of England, to which he or his descendants may be called; or if hereafter he be led to quit his native country, the American provinces of the empire would become the natural and appropriate seat of his government. These reasons would of course have been decisive against the acceptance of the crown, even if our policy had recommended it. But the policy of England is totally opposed to any such connexion. In Greece, as elsewhere, we confine our ambition to an indirect influence, reminding our Greek friends of the paramount importance of an honourable adherence to their financial engagements, and of the duty of patience and forbearance in their relations with their neighbours. It matters little what the birthplace of the future king of Greece may be, provided he become Greek: and the only nationality which concerns him, is that of his own people.

We trust, however, the representatives of the British Government will take the earliest opportunity of repelling the imputation that, because England is allied to Turkey, she is hostile to Greece. The old bugbear of Russian ascendancy at Constantinople has been buried under the ruins of Sebastopol. It is not to Russia, but to England, that the Christians of the East are prepared to look for countenance and counsel. It will be entirely our own fault if we forfeit their confidence. France

has made far more active efforts than we have done to obtain the regard of the Greek race; but the separation between them and a Roman Catholic Power cannot be overcome. Russia has courted them under the subtle influences of her clergy, but Russia has deceived them; the Greeks consider the Russian to be an Erastian Church, and they have detected, under her advances, the old schemes of territorial domination. The national Church of England, the free assemblies and press of England, and the belief that England had much rather relinquish her Ionian dependencies than extend them, have gained an indisputable hold on the Greek people, which is no doubt fostered by the prosperity and intelligence of the numerous Greek families settled in this country. The future progress of twelve millions of Christians, of a most intelligent race, the inhabitants of one of the finest and most interesting parts of the earth, depends very much on the attitude the English people may assume towards them; and the Eastern question will at last be resolved, as the Italian question has been, by the irresistible claims of a nation numerically and intellectually superior to its oppressors.

It has often been said that Paris may be the metropolis of Europe, but London is the metropolis of the world. The remark is, with a slight allowance for exaggeration, true; and it applies even more forcibly to our foreign relations than to our capital city. France exercises over the continent of Europe, by her language, by her manners, by her fashions, by her revolutions, an influence we do not pretend to emulate. But if you would measure the destinies of the globe, as you measure the longitude in distant seas, it is from the meridian of Greenwich that the reckoning runs. To this country the union or the division of North America, the progress of South America, the internal condition of China, the peace of India, the welfare of the Indian people, the exploration of Australia, the tranquillity of South Africa, are in reality matters of incomparably greater interest and importance than the petty differences which commonly give birth to diplomatic controversies in a European Court. We may be permitted to assume some indifference on such topics, when our immediate interests call us in another direction. The large view of the policy and the mission of England is to judge of them in relation to the affairs of the whole world. What, for example, has occurred within our memory at all comparable, in its effect on the present condition and future prospects of mankind, to the American revolution? Its consequences literally exhaust speculation. It has let loose over a vast continent, and amongst thirty millions of human

beings, all the destructive passions of civil war. The calamities of America will, ere long, become as universal as her prosperity had been before; and for the same reason — that the whole country must share the same fate. The Constitution which promised peace, freedom, and law for ever, and which maintained them for seventy years, has ceased to afford any one of these blessings. To revert to the past is impossible. Nay, those who professed to take up arms for the defence of the Union are the very men who repudiate the first conditions of its existence.

Our limits forbid us to follow this train of thought. But we have placed at the head of this article the title of an Essay by Judge Curtis — perhaps the greatest living authority on American constitutional law — which we earnestly recommend to the attention of our readers. No one can lay down in more clear and emphatic language the entire illegality of the President's exorbitant claim, as head of the army, to decree by Proclamation the emancipation of negroes in the Southern States, which Congress itself had no power to touch, and the not less gross outrage of converting into a military offence any act which may be construed into 'a disloyal practice.' The authority of the President over the army is no authority (says Judge Curtis) to disobey or supersede the laws of the country. 'These edicts spring from the assumed power to extend martial law over the whole territory of the United States — a power, for the exercise of which there is no warrant whatever in the Constitution—a power which no free people could confer upon an executive officer, and remain a free people.' (*Curtis*, p. 30.) The Federal Congress, being by the terms of the Constitution a limited and not a sovereign Power, has only aggravated the illegality of these violations of the Federal Compact by adopting them. It would seem that the old Constitution of 1789 can only be defended by measures which destroy it.

But to resume. Our immediate object is to consider the state of our own relations with the American belligerents, and to offer some remarks on a question which has already been submitted to the Cabinet, and which must apparently, at no distant time, press for a solution. At what period of this contest will the European Powers be justified by international law in recognising the independence of the Seceded Confederate States? At what period will it be expedient for them to take that step, or to endeavour, by friendly interposition, to mitigate the horrors of the war, both to America and to ourselves? These are questions of prodigious gravity; but they are questions to which an answer must be given.

We are content to take the doctrine of international law, with reference to the recognition of insurgent or separatist provinces or colonies, from an authority which the Americans cannot decline — that of the late Mr. Wheaton, a name revered in both continents. After laying it down that ‘while the civil war continues, other States may remain indifferent spectators in the controversy, still continuing to treat the ancient government as sovereign, and the government *de facto* as a society entitled to the rights of war against its enemy, or may espouse the cause of the party they believe to have justice on its side,’ Mr. Wheaton observes that ‘the acknowledgment and independence of the New State involves questions which belong rather to the science of politics than of international law.’* .

* Wheaton broadly asserts:— ‘If the foreign State professes neutrality, it is bound to allow impartially to both belligerent parties the free exercise of those rights which war gives to public enemies against each other; such as the right of blockade, and of capturing contraband and enemy’s property.’ (P. 32.) So likewise Mr. Justice Story laid it down, in the case of the ‘*Santissima Trinidad*’ (Wheaton’s Reports, vol. vii. p. 337.) ‘The Government of the United States has recognised the existence of a civil war between Spain and her colonies, and has avowed a determination to remain neutral between the parties, and to allow to each the same rights of asylum and hospitality and intercourse. Each party is, therefore, deemed by us a belligerent nation, having, so far as concerns us, the sovereign rights of war. We cannot interfere to the prejudice of either belligerent without making ourselves a party to the contest, and departing from the posture of neutrality.’ This decision, therefore, entirely disposes of the complaints raised by the Federal party against the doctrine of the Queen’s proclamation.

The same judgment disposes, with equal authority, of the remonstrances recently made by the American Government against the alleged fitting out of the Confederate cruiser ‘Alabama’ in a British port. In 1822 the ‘Independencia,’ formerly an American ship, was equipped in Baltimore and despatched for the use of the then revolutionary Government of Buenos Ayres. She sailed under the American flag; but on her arrival at Buenos Ayres she became a public ship of war of that State, and was held, by the American Courts, to be legally entitled to that character. As to the legality of this adventure, Mr. Justice Story said:— ‘The question as to the original illegal armament and outfit of the “Independencia” may be dismissed in a few words. It is apparent that though equipped as a vessel of war, she was sent to Buenos Ayres on a commercial adventure, contraband, indeed, but in no shape violating our laws or our national neutrality. If captured by a Spanish ship of war during the voyage, she would have been justly con-

There are, then, three degrees of recognition; the first being that already mentioned, the bare recognition of belligerent rights based on the sole fact of civil war; the second, the establishment of diplomatic relations with the seceding States, accompanied by treaties of commerce and amity; the third, a direct alliance, amounting, of course, to intervention in the quarrel. The first of these acknowledgments we were bound to make. The second we may make when we conceive it to be justified by the duration and prospects of the war, and by our own national interests; it is not necessarily inconsistent with neutrality; and as long as a recognition of this class is accompanied by no actual breach of neutrality, it affords no legitimate ground of complaint to the other party in the quarrel. The third is, of course, tantamount to a declaration of war. Mr. Wheaton observes, that even in 1778, when France concluded her first treaty with the United States, 'had the French Court conducted itself with good faith, and maintained an impartial neutrality between the belligerent parties, it may be doubted whether the treaty of commerce, or even the mutual alliance between France and the United States, could have furnished any just ground for a declaration of war against France by the British Government.' We cannot agree with this opinion in that particular case, because the very first article of the French Treaty of 1778 provided that, in the event of war, the two States should 'make common cause against Great Britain;' and the treaty was notoriously only the consummation of numerous acts of covert hostility. But Mr. Wheaton's remark, and the practice of the American Cabinet itself, boasting of the promptitude with which it invariably recognises all *de facto* governments, without pausing for a moment to consider the legality of their origin, seem to us entirely to preclude that Power from objecting to the simple recognition of the Southern Confederacy as long as it is not accompanied by any armed intervention in the war. In other words, it is no ground of remonstrance, much less of war, if a Power thinks fit to give to a new State the benefit of its moral recognition, without committing any act which is a breach of positive neutrality.

It has been argued, with considerable ability and authority,

'demned as good prize, and for being engaged in a traffic prohibited by the law of nations. *But there is nothing in our laws, or in the law of nations, that forbids our citizens from sending armed vessels, as well as munitions of war, to foreign ports for sale.*'

We will not affirm that this is good law; but, at any rate, it is law which cannot be impugned by the American Government.

that foreign States are not warranted by the law of nations in extending their recognition to a province or colony contending for its independence, unless the contest be already terminated by the admission of the mother State, or, unless, at least, the contest is so far advanced as to leave no doubt of the ultimate success of the separatists, and of the fact that they have actually established a lasting independent government.

These propositions appear to us to call for some further investigation by the light of precedents and of principles. It would be easy to quote numerous examples of a different, perhaps an opposite character. Thus to go back as far as the sixteenth century, at the time of the insurrection of the Netherlands against Spain, England at once entered into negotiations with them, and when they declared their independence in 1585 English agents were sent to Antwerp and a treaty of alliance was concluded in the same year; yet the manifesto of Elizabeth, proclaiming her interest in the Low Countries, did not lead to an immediate rupture with Spain, though it was ultimately followed by war.* The independence of the Netherlands was recognised by all the Powers of Europe, before it was acknowledged (in 1648) by Spain. In 1660, the Portuguese threw off the Spanish yoke, and raised the House of Braganza to the throne; the independence of Portugal was recognised within a year by England, France, and the Northern Courts; Spain only acknowledged the loss of the subject kingdom in 1668. These precedents were invoked by the American emissaries of 1777 to the Court of France; and within twenty months of the Declaration of Independence, France consented to espouse the cause of the young Republic. It is true that this was done on grounds of policy avowedly hostile to England, to avenge the loss of Canada fifteen years before. But the French rested their right to recognise the American Government on the simple fact that they were 'in full possession' of their independence. The answer of the Court of St. James' was drawn up by Gibbon, and may be read in the fourth volume of his miscellaneous works; but he treats the question as an act of treacherous hostility, and repudiates, not so much the recognition, as the intervention, of a foreign State.

* See an animated account of these negotiations in the third and sixth chapters of Mr. Mottley's 'History of the United Netherlands.' The Queen, however, well foresaw that war with Spain was at the end of her dealings with Holland, and the Armada was destined to exact the penalty.

But there are cases of a more direct application. Mr. Canning had occasion more than once to consider and act upon these principles in the course of his administration. The power of Spain in her possessions in North and South America had never been really restored after the Peninsular War: in 1824 their practical independence was complete; the United States had already formally recognised it; and on the opening of Parliament in 1825, the Minister announced in terms, which have remained in history, that England acknowledged them as Sovereign States. The Spanish Government complained; and Mr. Canning answered in the following terms, which express the true grounds of recognition with the utmost precision and force:—

‘The separation of the Spanish Colonies from Spain had been neither our work nor our wish. Events, in which the British Government had no participation, decided that separation — a separation which we are still of opinion might have been averted, if our counsels had been listened to in time. But out of that separation grew a state of things to which it was the duty of the British Government (in proportion as it became the plain and legitimate interest of the nation whose welfare was committed to its charge) to conform its measures, as well as its language, not hastily and precipitately, but with due deliberation and circumspection.

‘To have continued to call that a possession of Spain in which all Spanish occupation and power had been actually extinguished and effaced, could have rendered no practical service to the mother-country, but it would have risked the peace of the world. For all political communities are responsible to other political communities for their conduct; that is, they are bound to perform the ordinary international duties, and to afford redress for any violation of the rights of others by their citizens or subjects. Now, either the mother-country must have continued responsible for acts over which it could no longer exercise the shadow of a control, or the inhabitants of those countries whose independent political existence was, in fact, established, but to whom the acknowledgment of that independence was denied, must have been placed in a situation in which they were wholly irresponsible for all their actions, or were to be visited for such of those actions as might furnish ground of complaint to other nations, with the punishment due to pirates and outlaws. If the former of these alternatives — the total irresponsibility of unrecognised States — be too absurd to be maintained; and if the latter — the treatment of their inhabitants as pirates and outlaws — be too monstrous to be applied, for an indefinite length of time, to a large portion of the habitable globe; no other choice remained for Great Britain, or for any country having intercourse with the Spanish-American Provinces, but to recognise in due time their political existence as States, and thus to bring them within the pale of those rights and duties which civilised nations are bound

mutually to respect, and are entitled reciprocally to claim from each other.' (*Annual Register*, 1825.)

The next case was that of Greece, which it also fell to the lot of Mr. Canning to decide. When the Greek insurrection broke out in 1820, the British Government professed, and designed to maintain, a strict neutrality; but it was compelled, in obedience to the principles we have already adverted to, to acknowledge the belligerent character of the insurgents. In spite of the heroic resistance of the Greeks to the Turkish armies, they were, at the end of five or six years, exhausted by the unequal contest. Mr. Canning proffered the mediation of England, but it was indignantly rejected by the Porte. At length, in 1826, a protocol was signed by the Duke of Wellington at St. Petersburg, which virtually recognised the independence of Greece, at least on the footing of the other Christian Hospodarates. Turkey still resisted; and at length the battle of Navarino and the peace of Adrianople settled the question. In this case it is important to remark that the Christian Powers interfered and recognised the independence of Greece *not because the contest was over*, or because there was any well-grounded hope of the triumph of the insurgents, *but precisely for the opposite reason*. In 1826 it was apparent that the Greeks could not maintain their independence—that they must be beaten, if left to struggle single-handed against the whole power of Mahmoud—and therefore on grounds of humanity and policy the Christian Powers interposed, even by force of arms, to extort from Turkey the recognition of their freedom.

On the last case, which is that of Belgium, it is hardly necessary to dwell, though in this case also France and England proceeded to recognise the independence of Belgium, not because that independence was already virtually established, but, on the contrary, because it could not have been established without their recognition and support. The King of the Netherlands had, in the first instance, appealed to the Conference to uphold the Treaties of 1815, which had placed Belgium under his sceptre. Two of the Powers refused to support his pretensions. They even compelled him to yield to terms, and terminated the quarrel by overruling almost all his claims.

The inference we draw from these precedents is, that the Governments which have the highest respect for the principles of international law have never conceived themselves to be precluded by any positive obligation of public law from recognising the independence of a new State, which had shown a certain amount of spirit and power in maintaining its own rights, and was *de facto* in full possession of those rights. The present learned

Queen's Advocate, Sir Robert Phillimore, seems to go even further, for he says in the chapter on Intervention in the first volume of his 'Commentaries on International Law,' quoting Sir James Mackintosh :—

'We have at present no concern with the wisdom or policy of such an intervention; that is a National, not an International question. There is, however, one proposition with respect to this kind of intervention which cannot be too broadly or distinctly stated. In order to justify such intervention, the kingdom in which it is to take place *must be really divided against itself*—there must be therein two parties in the *bonâ fide* condition of waging actual war upon each other. No mere temporary outbreak, no isolated resistance to authority, no successful skirmish, is sufficient for this purpose: there should be "such a contest as exhibits some equality of force, and of which, if the combatants were left to themselves, the issue would be in some degree doubtful." (Phillimore, vol. i. p. 443.)

The present contest in America certainly comes fully up to this definition. Indeed, such is its magnitude that it may well be doubted whether the Americans themselves will have the power to terminate it without the good offices of a third party. The conflagration may go on to rage until the country is well nigh destroyed, because no one in the country has the strength to extinguish it; therefore the time may come when foreign mediation will be hailed by wise and prudent men as the sole means of escape from greater evils. It is impossible, and it would be at variance with all our principles, for a foreign Government to pronounce on the legality of the causes and motives which have led to the separation. If that test were to be applied very few revolutions would bear the proof. The very nature of the strife implies that law has been set aside. We hold then that in deciding this question we must be governed mainly by the facts of the case. In Mr. Wheaton's words, 'it belongs rather to the science of politics than to law;' and this is, beyond all doubt, the rule on which the American Government has, in similar cases, invariably acted. Does any one imagine that if the whole of Ireland had been for twenty months in the possession of its independence, and that the British armies had thrice been driven back across St. George's Channel, after a vain attempt to subdue the island, the Cabinet of Washington would not long ago have sent diplomatic agents to the Cabinet of Dublin—ay, and something more than diplomatic agents to the coast of Connemara?

With due respect therefore for the claims of a people, now struggling with great difficulties and perils, and with entire deference to the principles of justice and law which may fairly

be applied to the subject, we arrive at the conclusion that the conduct of the European Powers, and of England in particular, ought to be governed, not by any extreme consideration for either party in the United or disunited States, not by any imaginary restriction of law, but by the interest of our own fellow-subjects rightly understood. We hold that the war has continued long enough to give us full liberty of action; and we think it may fairly be assumed that whatever be the result of the struggle, it *cannot* restore the Union to its former condition. For all practical purposes, as regards the Southern States, the Union has ceased to exist. But owing to the terms of the late American Constitution, the Union alone represented the members of which it was federally composed in their foreign relations. Hence we are led back to the argument Mr. Canning applied to the case of the Spanish Colonies, when he pointed out the absurdity of 'the total irresponsibility of unrecognised States.' Europe has many and great interests in the South: how are they to be protected? how are her rights to be enforced? An appeal to the Cabinet of Washington against an outrage in Alabama would be a bootless absurdity. Even the Federal Treaties can no longer be enforced in Southern ports, where foreign Consuls have now no more than a nominal authority. It is only by direct intercourse with the rulers of the South that these necessary conditions of daily life can be renewed. This state of things cannot last. A population of eight or ten millions, inhabiting a vast maritime territory, cannot be obliterated. Quite independently of any feeling for either side in this quarrel, and without any hostility to the North, the time is approaching when our relations with both fractions of the country must be placed on the same footing. Our policy ought not to be governed either by sympathy or by hostility to either party, but by 'the plain and legitimate interest of the nation' which is confided to the Ministers of the Crown.

As long as the Union existed, the Federal Government represented it abroad. We are now fairly warned by at least a third of the States that the Federal Government no longer represents them; therefore we fall back on the States themselves, which are political units, or on such other combinations as they may form. We can neither judge of their motives nor control their action. They originally combined in spite of us; they now divide in spite of themselves. Foreign nations can only accept the result, however they may deplore the cause of so much destruction, lawlessness, and bloodshed. The right of protecting our own national interests is quite enough to justify any step which it may now be expedient to

take; and, although we have not gained much credit for it in America, we take leave to add that the forbearance and respect for the rights of others which has led the people of this country to submit in unbroken patience to a very questionable blockade of most disastrous effect on our own industry, and to endure a variety of other petty insults, are without a precedent in history.

The question, then, is not in our judgment one of principle, but of expediency. It is simply whether the time is come to do what we all believe must sooner or later be done. It is improbable that the recognition of the Southern States will be delayed by Europe, until it has been accepted at Boston, or until the last effort of the Federalists is exhausted. But, on the other hand, it would be in the highest degree cruel and impolitic to provoke a war between this country and either fraction of America, for objects which do not directly concern us. We do not at present perceive that any substantial benefit would arise either to ourselves or to the belligerents by a nominal recognition of a State, with which we cannot even communicate by the post. Possibly the threat of foreign intervention would at once band all parties together to resist an external foe. If we have no reason to assail the North, still less reason have we to befriend the South. The mere recognition of the South would not raise the blockade, and indeed the establishment of diplomatic relations would not be easily effected with a country thus cut off from the rest of mankind. The time may come when the conciliatory overtures of the European States may possibly be hailed with secret satisfaction by a considerable party in America. But it is probable that no such party is at present in existence, or at least that no such party dares give voice to its hopes.

For these reasons the crude and ill-timed proposition made in November by M. Drouyn de Lhuys to the English and Russian Governments could by no possibility succeed. The elections were then taking place. A change of generals and operations was about to ensue. The autumnal campaign was not yet over. Congress was soon to meet, when the views of the President would be more fully known. Everything was in a state of uncertainty and transition. It would seem as if the French Government placed no sort of reliance on its own suggestion, and was satisfied to publish the note in the '*Moniteur*' the following day. The answer of the English Cabinet was in the negative, but solely on the ground of the inopportunity of such a communication. Indeed Lord Russell justly remarked that one cogent reason against taking such a step out of season is,

that a failure would prevent the speedy renewal of the attempt. Since that proposal was made, however, several important changes have occurred, all extremely adverse to the Federal Government. The Republican party has been signally defeated at the State elections. The incapacity of the Executive Government has been plainly demonstrated. The financial difficulties of the Union are such that it requires American rashness to contend against them, and American credulity to believe in their removal. Above all, the winter campaign has proved a disastrous failure, and the close of the year completes the list of Federal reverses. Under such circumstances, it appears to us impossible that there should not be some undercurrent of reason and humanity in the Northern States, to protest against the continuance of so frightful and so hopeless a contest.

It is, however, hard to anticipate that the time will arrive when the Government of Mr. Lincoln will spontaneously or ostensibly accept an interposition which must of course start from a basis absolutely opposed to all they have been contending for. Under whatever form the independence of the South is presented to them, whether at the point of the sword or the point of the pen, the bare fact annihilates their cause and confounds their policy. To accept it is to acknowledge that hundreds of thousands of lives and hundreds of millions of money have been expended in vain; and that the white population of the Southern States cannot be enslaved in order that the blacks may be freed. Painful as these truths are to the pride of the Northern States, the time will come when the cry of humanity itself and the interests of the world will compel all the civilised Powers of Europe to assert them; and our hope is, that they will at length not be unheard in Washington and New York.

The conclusion we draw from these arguments is, that although we are not restrained by any positive obligation of public law from establishing more direct relations with the South, and that the British Government would be fully justified in taking that step if British interests required it, yet that, at present, no case for recognition has been made out, and that we must wait with patience, willing indeed to avail ourselves of any opportunity to terminate so disastrous a contest, but determined to avoid any step which might involve this country in its fatal consequences.

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
APRIL, 1863.

No. CCXL.

ART. I.—*The Invasion of the Crimea: its Origin and an Account of its Progress down to the Death of Lord Raglan.*
By ALEXANDER WILLIAM KINGLAKE. Vols. I. and II.
Edinburgh: 1863.

THIS History is the most remarkable book which has of late come before us; but it is also the book which most calls for exact and searching criticism. It has the freshness of an unwritten page of history, yet it awakens the remembrance of events which deeply stirred the heart of the nation. It records the greatest political transactions and the greatest military enterprise in which the men of our time have engaged. It exhibits the actors in these occurrences stripped of all disguise, for the author has not thought himself restrained by duty or discretion from dissecting to the quick the characters and motives of his own contemporaries. He has, therefore, thrown the passion of political life into this historical narrative, and he flavours it with the peremptory assertion, the biting sarcasm, the irritable sensitiveness, the lively retort of a man struggling to make a reputation in contentious debate. The result may be extremely flattering to Mr. Kinglake's literary pretensions. He has rendered the uninviting narrative of dead diplomatic negotiations attractive to fascination, by a vivid delineation of individual character and by a nice analysis of the wheelwork of affairs; and he has contrived to throw a romantic glow over the patrons and the clients for whose exaltation this history has, we presume, been chiefly written.

Apparently to heighten this effect, Mr. Kinglake has not been slow to cast upon the objects of his disfavour every reproach

and every insult of a pen strong in the power of invective; and these persons are, for the most part, not the enemies of our country, against whom this war was carried on, but the allies who joined us in the quarrel, who stood by us in battle and in suffering, and who powerfully contributed to the glorious termination of the enterprise. It is so repugnant to manly and generous feeling, thus to speak of the comrades who lately shared our perils and our success, that Mr. Kinglake must have endured all the pangs of wounded delicacy and outraged fellowship, before he could bring himself to write as he has done of those who formed and who maintained, with courage and good faith, the alliance of the French army with the army of Britain. Yet if he had undertaken this work for no other purpose than to inveigh against our French allies, the result would not be very different from that which is now before us. When an attempt was made by a French writer, M. de Bazancourt, to palm upon the world a hasty narrative of the Crimean War, in which the exploits of the English army were understated or omitted, we smiled at the folly of the book and the malignity of the narrator: but when we find an English historian—boasting of official information producing a work of no hasty growth, but of a seven years' incubation—who, nevertheless, appears to have employed a misplaced ingenuity to do the greatest possible amount of injustice to every motive and every act of our principal ally, the impression we receive is more serious and more painful.

Therefore, at the very outset of these remarks, we are irresistibly led to disclaim all participation in that febrile vanity and feminine irritability which presumes to vindicate the national pretensions of one nation at the expense of another. Mr. Kinglake appears to think that some incidents, which arose out of the alliance of the two countries, were derogatory to England. We are not aware of it, and we shall dispute the assertion. But we are confident that in the whole of these transactions nothing has taken place which we so much regret as this fact, that an English history of the war should bear on every page of it the taint of malignant aversion to the Emperor of the French, of coarse insult to most of the chiefs of the French Government and army, and of studied unfairness—sometimes of poisonous inuendo—against the French troops. These are feelings which Englishmen not only do not share, but do not comprehend. We doubt not that they will destroy the permanent value of Mr. Kinglake's book, and the respect which might otherwise be due to his literary gifts. The sense of justice and the spirit of generosity, which Mr. Kinglake

ascribes to the nobler members of the English race, will never endure that we should seek or accept the aid and alliance of a powerful and high-spirited nation in war, that we should triumph by our combined efforts,—those of both countries being equally essential to the result,—and then that seven years afterwards, the hand of a slowly-writing scribe should be employed to gibbet the leaders of one people in infamy, whilst those of the other are promoted to great and perhaps unmerited fame by the concealment of their errors and the exaggeration of their virtues. Was it necessary to rake up all the scandal and the shame attached to the earlier life of Marshal St. Arnaud in order to make a hero of Sir Richard Airey? * Did the pure and noble reputation of Lord Raglan require to be set off by a biography of the French Emperor, stained and distorted by the mean insinuations of personal virulence and party hatred? We wish that before Mr. Kinglake had given these chapters to the public he had paused to ask himself one question. He professes the highest veneration for the memory of Lord Raglan. He has been chosen (and it is no slight honour) to examine his private and public papers, and to relate his achievements. Does Mr. Kinglake believe that Lord Raglan, if he were alive, would have sanctioned this publication? Would he not have condemned it as an intemperate production—discourteous to his gallant companions in arms, and injurious to the good relations between two great nations? We are content to leave the work to the verdict of the public on this issue.

Throughout these volumes the alliance of the French Government with that of the Queen of England is described as an alliance of knaves and dupes. Every step taken by the united Powers is the result of some diabolical artifice, concocted in the Tuileries, to draw the unsuspecting British Cabinet into war, to sever us from our natural allies, to place us in humiliating dependence on France. So that if Mr. Kinglake's version of these events is to pass for history, a cabinet of English statesmen, consisting of all the foremost men of the country, and comprising several shades of opinion, was a mere tool in the hands of those whom he describes as 'the conspirators of December,' and our boasted

* Sir Richard Airey, when he was arraigned before the Chelsea Board of Enquiry for the maladministration of his department, with excellent judgment secured the services of the author of this history, who, it is well known, wrote his defence; a striking example of confidence on one side and of courage on the other. A sense of the mutual obligation pervades even these volumes.

freedom served us so little that the despotism of a foreign Power prompted and determined our policy. A supposition more cynical and more unfounded was never put forward by our worst enemies. Throughout these transactions we shall show, though Mr. Kinglake affects to deny the fact, that the policy of England had its full share in guiding the course of events, and that her policy was directed by a lofty conception of her own duties and of the public interests. It is true, and it would be ungenerous to conceal it, that England had not the military power to give effect to that policy without the aid of France. We could not alone have sent an English army to meet the Russians on the Danube. We could not alone have invaded the Crimea. We could not have met the vast hosts of Russia on equal terms. We could not have taken Sebastopol. These things were done by the alliance. They could not have been done without it. Would Mr. Kinglake have preferred to see the 'conspirators of December' leagued with the Czar, and lending themselves to the partition of Turkey? That, indeed, is what they might well have done, if they had been animated by no motives but the abject selfishness imputed to them in this history. Louis Napoleon took the opposite course. He took the course most congenial to the policy of England, and he used the whole strength of France, which the revolution had placed in his hands, to support that policy. He renounced, at our suggestion, all territorial aggrandisement in this war. He combated and overcame the anti-English prejudices of the army and the people of France, —that army and that people which had just raised him to power. Is it then for an English writer to forget these things —to traduce every motive of an allied sovereign—to calumniate his own Government in his blind desire to outrage France —and thus to make this record of a joint war a cause of irritation and offence, injurious, as far as its influence extends, to the union of the two most powerful nations of the world, whose happiness and safety lie in their mutual esteem and good will?

Not such, in our judgment, not such is the spirit in which the historian of the Crimean war ought to have entered upon his task. The writer who undertook this great national theme, and to whom important materials were confidentially intrusted, contracted an obligation of no common weight. His work has in it something of a public character. His voice ought to have had in it something of the voice of England—some tenderness to the faults of others, some modesty in remembering our own. This book may be read by posterity and by foreign nations

(if it be read by them at all), as a record of the deliberate judgment of the country. It ought to have been just, generous, and conciliatory towards France. But no such sense of obligation has checked or embarrassed Mr. Kinglake's sportive and sarcastic pen. The book is throughout composed of his own impressions; he has made it the vehicle of his personal animosities and predilections;—he has not risen to the great objective conception of a memorable War, affecting the destinies of the world. A bombastic expression, a quaint picture, a pungent or humorous turn of phrase, a gust of vindictive passion or a mere fit of peevishness, suffice to conceal from him the most important incidents in the transaction he is relating. The very defects of the book make it entertaining in a rare degree, and have given it the run of the circulating libraries: but we shall not do Mr. Kinglake the injustice to suppose that he aspires only to gratify the prevalent taste for strong and smart writing. We shall endeavour to judge of the merit of his performance by a higher standard.

Before, however, we proceed to notice in detail the more salient points of his political narrative, the style in which the work is written claims attention. To say that it is written with art, would be an inadequate term. It is composed with a degree of skill and study amounting to artifice. The language, for the most part of a sturdy Saxon root, aims sometimes at rusticity; but even in this dress Mr. Kinglake reminds us of a man of fashion disguised as a countryman on the stage. Sometimes it is archaic, and even Biblical, as if the Eastern rambles of its author had left upon his lips some lingering veneration for the most ancient records of our race. Sometimes it is lyrical, and Mr. Kinglake is not afraid to brave that ripple of derision which is apt in these times to follow a piece of the finest writing. In every page we find the same incessant labour and the same exquisite finish; but these qualities reach their climax in the keen rapier-like thrusts with which Mr. Kinglake assails the reputation of most of his contemporaries. The characters he has traced of Lord Palmerston, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, Marshal St. Arnaud, and many others, are not unworthy of the touch of Mephistopheles. They are inimitably like—but it is the likeness of caricature—likeness which is rendered more intense by as much as it exceeds truth. This tendency to exaggeration is heightened by the introduction of personal details, borrowed from the laboured portraiture of the old-fashioned romances:—Lord Stratford is always ‘pinching his thin, tight, merciless lips, or displaying the sea-

'blue depth of his eyes under the shadow of the Canning brow'—the Emperor Napoleon is drawn in colours which we decline to copy—Lord Raglan is generally presented in what the tailors call a 'regimental undress,' and may be known from afar by the loss of his arm—even General Airey displays 'keen, 'salient, sharp-edged features' on the field of Alma, 'with an 'eager, swooping crest (it was always strained forward and 'intent).' These touches are what, if they were used by another man, Mr. Kinglake would probably describe as ornithological. He delights, moreover, to animate his personages with furious passions. They are all very 'fierce'—many of them are 'tortured' by anger and resentment. Even Lord Aberdeen has a 'passionate hatred of war.' To judge from this history, the motive power of modern politics is to be always in a passion. We have too much real respect for Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, and for the memory of Lord Aberdeen and of Lord Raglan, to recognise them at all in these histrionic attitudes.

Mr. Kinglake never writes without wit, not often without refinement, we therefore the more regret that he should have stooped to the vulgarity of nicknames, and to tricks of vituperation unworthy of his pen. Nature and simplicity it would be vain to ask of him, for in the efforts he makes to be natural and simple every trace of these qualities departs. He is most at his ease either in launching a sarcasm elaborately concise, or in describing in large bursts of eloquence the pomp and circumstance of war. His love and sympathy for arms we take to be genuine, though, by his reckless remarks on others, he appears to want the delicate sense of military honour. Yet no doubt he may have been cast in an heroic mould, and it is possible that literature and law have deprived England of a great warrior. These gifts are more than sufficient to command readers and to excite attention. The introductory volume may here and there be rather tedious, but it is enlivened by a vein of the keenest satire: a narrative of a battle in 300 pages may be rather long, but no man can read of the stately march of the Allied Forces from the landing-place to the Alma, or storm the Great Redoubt with Codrington, Lacy Yea, and the Grenadier Guards, without a thrill of pugnacity. Yet, we fear, these ebullitions of martial prose will not stand the test of time. Napier indulged in them sometimes; but though Napier has written the finest military history in the language, these flights are not the parts of it which are most justly admired. Mr. Kinglake would have a more indisputable right to lasting fame in English historical literature,

if he had condescended to write with more sobriety. The extreme vivacity of his diction offends good taste; in his constant efforts to be impressive, graphic, and original, he is sometimes extravagant, sometimes unintelligible. The vitality of books depends on more simple conditions. In the long run the world despises all these tricks of rhetoric. A political pamphlet is the most spirited of compositions, but it is the most ephemeral. The real test of the value of a history is accuracy of narrative, true insight into character and motives, and a just estimate of the causes and results of each link in a chain of events. It remains to be seen how far the 'Invasion of the Crimea' fulfils these conditions.

It would have been well for his readers, and for his own reputation, if Mr. Kinglake had been content to execute the purpose denoted by the title of his history, and confined himself to a military narrative of the Crimean expedition. But the whole of his first volume consists of political speculations, and a satirical analysis of the causes of the war, in which he is constantly out of his depth, often inaccurate, and sometimes under the influence of savage and unreason-able passion. Lord Raglan does not appear in the whole volume. No original matter or information is to be found in it, except here and there a ludicrous anecdote, or a random assertion of doubtful authority. This part of the work appears to be made up by a sedulous, but not accurate, study of the 'Eastern Papers' presented to Parliament at the time. It is evident that Mr. Kinglake has not had access to any other portion of the political correspondence—indeed, we believe that access was refused to him by the Foreign Office. He therefore knows just what the public knew before, and much less than those persons (not few in number) who were actively engaged in these negotiations. From these materials Mr. Kinglake has attempted to extract a general theory of the causes of the war, and of the motives which regulated the successive movements of all the Cabinets in Europe. His conclusions may fairly be stated in the following terms, in which we have endeavoured to condense the whole substance of the book:—

That the war originated in the interference of France in the question of the Holy Places, and was fomented, and at last rendered inevitable, by the skill with which the French Government, to serve its own ends, continued to exasperate Russia and entangle England in the quarrel.

That Russia, not having intended to do any act leading to war, and least of all to war with England, was deceived by

the language of Lord Aberdeen and the Peace Party, and subsequently irritated to such a degree in her religious sentiments, by the naval measures of the Maritime Powers, that she threw herself headlong into a career of deceit and violence.

That the Turks showed themselves warlike, wise, 'highly skilled in so much of the diplomatic art as was needed for them in this temporal world,' men of faith and religious enthusiasm, 'who kept their arms bright,' and who, 'except in the possible event of their being overwhelmed with some panic, were *not* liable to be speedily crushed by an army forcing the Danube and the Balkan.'

That France, having fallen by the *coup-d'état* of the 2nd December 1851 into the hands of a gang of scoundrels and cut-throats, was driven into the war by them, solely to efface the impression produced on the nation by their crimes, and to reward by high military commands the men who had recently betrayed the liberties of their country.

That France, deeming the alliance of England advantageous to the personal interests of her new rulers, detached England from joint action with the German Powers, whereby the war might have been prevented, and, by inducing England to take successive steps as a maritime Power, engaged her in the defence of Turkey, and so provoked Russia as to render the war inevitable.

That the English Government fell into this snare, and, whilst it regarded the French alliance as the best means of preserving peace in Europe, was unconsciously the tool of the warlike schemes of France; and that Lord Palmerston alone understood this trick, and was a party to the fraud upon his colleagues.

That Austria would in the end have compelled Russia to evacuate the Principalities without hostilities, if the Western Powers had consented to follow the lead of the Cabinet of Vienna and its German allies.

That although the whole war might have been avoided by firm adherence to the German Powers, yet the highest honour is due to the English Ambassador who caused the rejection of the Vienna Note, and thereby led to the separate action of the Western and the German States; moreover, that although the enterprise against the Crimea was rash, and ought not to have been ordered by the English Cabinet, yet that the highest honour is due to those military officers who, against their own judgment, undertook to conduct it.

These are the leading charges made by Mr. Kingleake against the British Government and its allies. These are the leading

propositions he seeks throughout these volumes to establish; for in the grand style of historical composition the theory comes first and the facts are introduced to support it. We undertake to assert, and we hope to prove, that not one of these propositions is consistent with the truth of history; and that, in his whole treatment of the 'Transactions which brought on the 'War,' Mr. Kinglake is continually attacking phantoms of his own creation, which had no real influence on the event; and that he not unfrequently overlooks altogether the true causes which were in operation.

The origin of a quarrel is proverbially obscure. Even the cause of the great Irish faction-fights of the 'three-year-olds' and the 'four-year-olds' is hidden in mystery, though it is believed to have something to do with the age of a bull. In like manner, the dispute of the Greek and Latin Churches, under their Russian and French patrons, is supposed to have led to the Crimean war. Mr. Kinglake holds the balance with no even hand between the parties in this contest—on the one side, 'pilgrims from the brave pious people of the North;' on the other, 'a mere French tourist, with a journal and a theory, 'and a plan of writing a book'—exactly such a book as that which first made known Mr. Kinglake's literary powers. Accordingly, M. de Lavalette is described as continuing to press his demands upon the Porte in violent language and with offensive threats, whilst the Russian Envoy, better versed in affairs, 'used wiser but hardly less cogent words.'

It is unnecessary to follow Mr. Kinglake into the question of the Grotto, the Silver Star, or the Key of the Church of Bethlehem. These, or any other puerilities, may suffice for monks or diplomatists to quarrel about, but they are not of a nature to lead necessarily or naturally to serious results. Serious results ensue when hidden causes of a far more powerful efficacy are also at work. In this instance, France had long endeavoured to obtain for the Latin Church in Palestine the best conditions she could, and to enforce claims already conceded by former treaties. Russia had no such treaty. The struggle was not religious, it was not sentimental; it was one of those contentions for national ascendancy in which French agents are apt to indulge.

It should, however, be remarked, which Mr. Kinglake has failed to do, that after a careful examination of the documents and treaties relating to the Holy Places, Fuad Effendi and his colleagues declared, voluntarily, to Colonel Rose that the claim of France *was just*, and that if her rights under the treaty of 1740 were examined '*d'une manière juridique*,' she might claim

many more sanctuaries than those given her by the note of the 9th February. The Grand Vizier was of the same opinion. As these are Turks, perhaps Mr. Kinglake may attach some weight to their declaration. The truth is that France obtained no more than she was strictly entitled to, though she had been indiscreet in the mode of claiming her rights. Russia made this the pretext for claiming that to which she had no title whatever.

The first direct representation on the subject of the Sanctuaries was made to the Porte by France, as early as May 1850. It was disputed by Russia. The Porte stood perplexed between the two Powers, and had, in fact, given incompatible promises to each of them. In December 1852, the Latin Patriarch placed the glittering Star in the Sanctuary of Bethlehem, and obtained possession of the Great Key. But Mr. Kinglake omits to state that, in the same month, the Russians proceeded to unmask far more serious pretensions. M. d'Ozeroff, at Constantinople, formally declared to M. de Lavalette that *Russia claimed a protectorate of the orthodox Church in Turkey by virtue of the Treaty of Kainardji*; to which M. de Lavalette replied that France had no similar pretensions on behalf of the Latin Christian subjects of the Porte.* Here, then, was the real starting point of the quarrel; not when France and Russia were disputing with each other for privileges, to which they might or might not be entitled, but when Russia began to attempt to wring from the Porte a protectorate over a large number of its subjects. From this moment the conduct and policy of France became moderate and judicious; indeed, so far were the French Government from seeking to aggravate the dispute, that orders were sent from Paris to end it. M. de Lavalette had been intemperate in the earlier period of the discussion; on the 15th December, 1852, M. de Lavalette was recalled. On the 15th January, 1853, a most conciliatory despatch was addressed by M. Drouyn de Lhuys to the French Ambassador at St. Petersburg. But at the very same date the Russian Government sent forth an angry despatch (quoted by Mr. Kinglake, vol. i. p. 52.), and the mission of Prince Menschikoff was determined on, whilst an army of 144,000 Russians was ordered to hold itself in readiness to march upon Turkey. It was at this same time, January 1853, that the French Government proposed to that of England that the two Powers should act together for the purpose of preserving the integrity of the Turkish Empire, and the British Government

* Colonel Rose's despatch of 5th December, 1852.

fully concurred in this proposal, adding that some such understanding should be arrived at between all the Great Powers.

It will be observed that the greater part of these incidents has been passed over in silence by Mr. Kinglake, and that he therefore connects these formidable preparations of the ambition of the Czar 'with a crowd of monks quarrelling for a key at the 'sunny gates of a church in Palestine.'

In subsequent parts of his narrative Mr. Kinglake points out clearly enough the wide difference between the original dispute as to the Holy Places, and the claim of the Protectorate, which was the true cause of the war. In point of fact, the dispute of the Holy Places was actually settled, by the advice of Lord Stratford, at the very moment when the greater demand was definitively rejected by the Porte, and Russia prepared to enforce it by arms. Had there been no latent design behind, the Holy Places would have led to no war. It was Russia, not France, which engrafted on the original dispute a demand of a far more serious political character; which despatched Menschikoff to Constantinople to support that demand by threats, and thus enveloped the quarrel. England had carefully and wisely abstained from all interference in the question of the Holy Places; but the moment the other demand was made, she instantly, and of her own accord, took the most prominent place in resisting it. When, therefore, Mr. Kinglake asserts that

'The French President steadily continued his plan of driving the Porte into a quarrel with the Czar, until at length he succeeded in bringing about the event [by the delivery of the key and star to the Latin monks at Bethlehem, in December 1852], which was followed by the advance of the Russian armies; but the moment the Czar was wrought up into a state of anger, which sufficed to make him a disturber of Europe, Prince Louis, now Emperor of the French, sagaciously perceived that it might be possible for him to take violent means of appeasing the very troubles which he had just raised; and to do this by suddenly declaring for a conservative policy in Turkey.' (Vol. i. p. 319.)

he is evidently led astray by his own subtlety. France had no desire to bring about any war. The moment she saw there was danger of war, she adopted the line of policy most fitted to prevent it, in conjunction with this country: and it is probable that the war would have been prevented by that policy, if Russia had been governed by a man less headstrong, autocratic, and ignorant than the Emperor Nicholas. With singular perversity, and an utter contempt of facts, Mr. Kinglake attempts to fasten the authorship of the war on France,

when she was doing all we desired her to do to avert it: and he is half disposed to acquit the Emperor Nicholas of anything more than a fervour of religious enthusiasm which unluckily overpowered his judgment, his reason, and his honour. By one of those contradictions which are not unfrequent in these volumes, after having stated as above that France brought on the war, he asserts in another place (vol. i. p. 453.) that 'France being bereaved of political life, *was made to adopt* an Anglo-Turkish policy, and as the price of this concession to the views of our Foreign Office, the venturers of the 2nd December were brought under the sanctions of an alliance with the Queen of England.' So that he first makes England the dupe of France, and then France the tool of England. The truth is that more than a year elapsed between the *coup-d'état* of December 1851 and the commencement of the Russian dispute in December 1852. The Ruler of France had certainly not lost ground in that interval, for it was at the later date that he was raised to the Imperial throne, and it is absurd to suppose that war was indispensable to the duration of his power.

If it had suited Mr. Kinglake's purpose to retrace the whole reign of the Emperor Nicholas, as he has retraced the whole career of the Emperor Napoleon III.; an impartial historian might, perhaps, have found in the wrongs of Poland and the annals of Siberia some parallel for the most ferocious acts of despotic power. The two potentates are, however, touched with different tints. The policy of the one is palliated, even when it is tainted with the duplicity of Prince Menschikoff's mission or the brutality of Sinope; the policy of the other is condemned, even when it is compensated by a faithful alliance with our own country. Mr. Kinglake has a convenient theory that at a certain time of life the men of the Romanoff family undergo a 'deterioration which shakes the ascendant of their better nature,' and they then 'disclose the odd *purposeless* cunning of a gipsy or a savage, who shows by some *sudden and harmless* sign of his wild blood that he is not completely reclaimed.' There was nothing purposeless in the Czar's conversations with Sir Hamilton Seymour; there was nothing sudden and harmless in the gradual concentration of troops and all the other incidents which led to the war. If ever there was a deliberate political design, it was this; and if the Emperor Nicholas hoped to carry it through without war, it was solely because he had miscalculated the nature of his relations with all the other Powers. He expected to bully Turkey or to crush her—she resisted him successfully in council and in arms; he hoped to win over England, or he relied on her known aversion to war—England

scorned his bribes and took the field against him; he hoped to cajole Austria and command Prussia—the one opposed him, the other did him no good; he disbelieved in the alliance of France with England, and cared very little for the line the French might take in Eastern affairs; he succeeded, for the first time in European history, in bringing the French and English armies into the field, side by side, against his own troops. On every one of these points he was signally mistaken. But it was because he entertained these delusions, that he entered upon a course of policy so fatal to his own fame and power. Yet Mr. Kinglake affirms that ‘he did not at this time intend to take any steps which England would regard as an ‘outrage;’ although in the very next page he admits that the secret object of Menschikoff’s mission was to extort the Protectorate from Turkey, and that the instructions given to that personage ‘contravened with singular exactness the ‘honourable and generous assurances he had given to Europe.’ How then were they ‘honourable and generous?’ What was this but to outrage England, first, by deliberately attempting to deceive her, and afterwards by threatening and using violence to a Power, feebler indeed than Russia, but protected by the common interests of Europe? ‘What he chose ‘to do,’ says Mr. Kinglake, ‘that he did.’ And thus it was that when he rang the bell and ordered the officer in attendance to fling his troops across the Pruth, he did that for which he bears now and for ever the undivided responsibility.* We conclude, therefore, that although Mr. Kinglake’s character of the Emperor Nicholas is dashed off freely and without malice, as it only exhibits him as the slave of ignorance and angry passions, yet it is politically untrue, and does not measure the depth or the extent of his political designs. The actual demonstration of these designs was the enormous accumulation of military stores captured or destroyed by the Allies in Sebastopol. Those stores of war meant nothing if they did not mean the subjugation or dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire.

On one point Europe certainly shared the misconceptions of the Czar. Nobody in the West imagined the Turks capable of

* The story of his ringing the bell and giving the order is true. It was not till the next day that the Emperor told Count Orloff what he had done. Orloff looked grave, and said, ‘Sir, this is war! In ‘occupying the Principalities your Majesty has thrown down the ‘glove, Europe will take it up.’ These words made some impression on the Czar, and in relating the story, Count Orloff used to add, that if he had been consulted the day before, perhaps the fatal step would not have been taken.

making so good a defence. Mr. Kinglake enlarges on their warlike virtues, their religious enthusiasm when they were 'called to arms by a truculent course of sermons,' their patience and endurance in war; but in reality other considerations were uppermost in the minds of those who knew them best in the spring of 1853, and these points Mr. Kinglake has passed over in complete silence. The Turkish army had recently undergone a total change. Its Asiatic dress, arms, and formation had been abolished. An attempt had been made to convert it, by drill and tight uniforms, into a regular European force. The men were indeed brave and docile; but the officers were grossly ignorant. The cavalry, which had been one of its finest arms, was destroyed by the vain attempt to make the Oriental horsemen ride like troopers. The infantry was feeble. The material of war totally deficient in the fortresses—not abundant in the field. There was not a gun in the forts at the entrance of the Bosphorus from the Black Sea which could throw a shot with precision or effect. It was, therefore, not without reason that 'it was commonly believed that Turkey, if left unsupported, 'would lie completely at the mercy of the Czar.' Indeed, Mr. Kinglake himself admits in another place (p. 196.) that the Sultan 'was ill-prepared for an immediate encounter.' The truth is, that although by the process of these incomplete reforms the Turkish army had lost its old character of the ages of conquest, yet it still had merit and tenacity in the defence of positions, as was shortly afterwards proved under the skilful command of Omar Pacha—a general who did not expect of his troops more than they could do.

The Ottoman Empire was saved during the whole summer and autumn of 1853 by the want of energy on the part of Nicholas, and by the moral prestige of the Western Powers. Mr. Kinglake never seems to have considered what would have happened, if, on the return of Prince Menschikoff, or even on the declaration of war by Turkey, the Sebastopol fleet had sailed into the Bosphorus. Yet that contingency was one which appeared at the time highly probable, and one against which the Allies were bound to provide. Mr. Kinglake has well explained in another place that by occupying Wallachia, and extending a weak line up the Danube, Nicholas, on the contrary, gave the Turks the best chances against himself, by attacking the extremity of his line of operations. By drawing a romantic picture of the military resources of the Turks, and by omitting to notice the imminent danger to which they were at one time exposed, Mr. Kinglake has not represented the real state of the case, and consequently the true nature of the perils

which the Allied Powers were anxious to avert. These perils were far more serious than he has any idea of. When Prince Paskiewitsch assumed the command of the Russian army, Mr. Kinglake says that 'he promised the Czar an invasion of the 'Ottoman Empire.' But these words by no means convey the full extent of the plan of Nicholas. His design then was to march on Constantinople, but Prince Paskiewitsch made the fall of Silistria before May 1st the *sine quâ non* of this undertaking. This fact has an important bearing on another part of the case, presently to be considered.

The ambition of Russia, the weakness of Turkey, were *not*, then, in the judgment of Mr. Kinglake, the chief causes of this war. The grand discovery on which he prides himself is that the catastrophe was mainly due to the Satanic influence of the Ruler of France, who first creates the dispute about the Holy Places; then irritates Russia beyond endurance; then implicates England by a series of violent measures, disguised under the semblance of a desire for peace; and at last, having dissolved the union of the Four Courts, forces an offensive alliance with himself upon the Queen of England: all this was done because Louis Napoleon 'needed for his very life's sake to 'become conspicuous, whether as a disturber or as a pacificator 'of other nations, that Frenchmen might be brought to look at 'what he was doing to others, instead of what he had done to 'them.' Upon this theory Mr. Kinglake has based the whole introductory portion of his book; and he makes it the pretext of an episode, embracing the whole career of the Emperor Napoleon from the date of his Strasburg adventure, and attacking with a degree of violence and malice, not to be found in any English writer of history, the public and private life of the Emperor's chief supporters. We do not propose to follow Mr. Kinglake into these details, which are totally unconnected with the subject really before us; but we regard the publication of this chapter as something worse than an error of judgment. It indicates the existence of passions which are fatal to Mr. Kinglake's character as an impartial narrator of events. And it cannot be forgotten that the men thus rudely assailed are soldiers and statesmen with whom we have been actively and amicably connected for several years in the toils of war, in the business of politics, in the intercourse of private life, and we will add, as to some of them, by personal regard. Mr. Kinglake himself acknowledges the courteous, clear, and abundant assistance he has received from the French commanders. He gives us to understand that he did not himself disdain the hospitality of Colonel Leroy, otherwise called St. Arnaud, when he gave

a long vacation to a campaign in Northern Africa. His return for it is, needlessly to rake up every detail which can cast a stigma on their former lives and political conduct. He has stooped to employ all the vocabulary of abuse to charge the Emperor with degrading personal meannesses, which no one, even of his honourable opponents, ever ventured to impute to him, and which are in fact ludicrously untrue. On a hundred occasions Louis Napoleon has shown courage of a high order—courage of a higher order than that 'fiery quality' which Mr. Kinglake mistakes for it. He has stood unmoved by the assassins who have sought to take away his life with violence, and against the writers who have sought to destroy his name by invective. Fortunately for France and for Europe, his temperament is so cool and collected, that things which would have excited his uncle to frenzy, leave him calm; and his dignified composure has served him so well that not long ago a philosopher, who is certainly no Imperialist, observed in Paris, 'Perhaps, after all, it was not the First Napoleon who 'was Napoleon the Great!' Amongst the injurious epithets heaped upon the Emperor by Mr. Kinglake, he twice or thrice repeats that he is a 'literary man.' We know not what amount of obloquy the expression conveys in Mr. Kinglake's estimation, but we hold it far more useful for a pretender to a throne to wield his pen with excellent skill and judgment, than it is for a man of letters to figure in the actions of war which he pretends to describe.

With the history of the *coup-d'état* we have in this place nothing whatever to do; but although we have not changed our opinion as to the brutal and illegal mode in which that revolution was effected, we certainly do not accept Mr. Kinglake's version of it as literally correct. No authentic history of those days has yet been published, though more than one such record exists: and we think it needless to make further comments on the tales collected in Parisian salons, or the statements of infuriated refugees.* The practical question

* An examination of the details of this singular episode would lead us too far, but we are certain that Mr. Kinglake has allowed himself to be deceived in many particulars. One must suffice. He adopts M. Granier de Cassagnac's statement, that within the few weeks which followed the 2nd December, 26,500 persons were transported. If Mr. Kinglake had applied the arithmetical process to this assertion, he might have conjectured that it was unhistorical. The whole French army which landed at Old Fort hardly reached that number: how many transports did it take to convey them? Again: he considers the testimony of a British officer quite unimpeachable,

here to be considered is, what effect the revolution of the 2nd December, 1851, and the restoration of the empire, produced on the foreign policy of France? Mr. Kinglake asserts that these events led to the Crimean war: we think the reverse.

The return of the Bonapartist dynasty to power caused great alarm in Europe, and even in France. Men asked themselves at home and abroad, whether the heir of the Emperor was come back to resume the military policy of his uncle, to avenge his fall, to break up the settlement of 1815, and consequently to wage war with England and the Continental Powers. To this the new-made sovereign at once replied by his declaration at Bordeaux, '*L'Empire, c'est la Paix.*' The imperial policy has on the whole been pacific. But notwithstanding these pacific assurances and intentions, the Emperor was not indisposed to use any fair occasion which might arise to show that the armies of France had lost nothing of their prowess and power, and that the navy of France was equally ready to play a distinguished part in war. He was not sorry to take his stand by the side of England in defence of the public law of Europe,—to prove that if the rights of weak nations were threatened, they were threatened by the autocrat at St. Petersburg, and defended by the autocrat at Paris. None doubted his power, many doubted his forbearance and his fidelity: those, therefore, were the qualities which he sought to vindicate in the prosecution of this war. Such were the motives which we believe to have actuated the French Emperor in these transactions. They are laudable motives: they are motives which brought him into close alliance with this country; yet this is what Mr. Kinglake describes as seeming, in the eyes 'of the mistaken world, to give the sanction of the Queen's pure name to the acts of the December night, and to the Thursday, the day of blood.' A most offensive and untrue remark: as if to act with a man when he is right were, necessarily, to condone everything he may have done wrong.

We might, however, go even further. At the very time when Mr. Kinglake supposes that the Emperor Napoleon was resorting to all the artifices of intrigue to render war inevitable, we may now state, and we do so with certainty, that the French army was very ill-prepared to enter upon so great a contest, and that the Emperor knew it. The army had by no means recovered from the shock it had sustained in the revolution of

when he describes the massacre on the Boulevard, from a window, but he flatly contradicts the evidence of the British officers who saw the bodies of the slain after the engagement on the Telegraph Hill at the Alma.

1848. The cavalry and artillery were ill-horsed. The regiments in France were raw troops: and it was only by sending them to Algeria, and transferring the troops which had served in Africa to the Levant, that a respectable French force could be found to meet the formidable legions of Russia. It is an entire mistake to suppose that France was at that moment well-prepared for a great foreign war, or that she would have thrown herself into it, if it could have been avoided. She more than once complained, on the contrary, of the extent and vigour of the British military preparations, which, at first, exceeded her own.

But, says Mr. Kinglake, the artifice of France consisted in this—that being herself desirous of the alliance of England and (secondly) of war, she threw herself into the negotiations for the purpose of frustrating them by precipitate and irritating acts, and so destroyed the salutary combined influence of the Four Powers. A more complete figment never took possession of a man's imagination! It is hardly possible, without multiplying details to an intolerable extent, to show how entirely this theory is at variance with the facts; but we will notice one or two of the points on which Mr. Kinglake especially relies. He complains that England allowed herself to be drawn into a distinct and separate alliance with France, chiefly by consenting to engage in naval movements in which the German Powers had no share. ‘This was the fatal transaction which substituted ‘a cruel war for the peaceful but irresistible pressure which was ‘exerted by the Four Powers.’ Yet it is obvious that the Maritime Powers were alone in a condition to act at all. They alone could approach the Dardanelles or guard the Bosphorus. They alone could protect Constantinople. It is true that the Four Powers were acting in concert, as Lord Clarendon declared on the 12th August, and not the less in concert because Austria and Prussia knew that England had sent her fleet to the Levant. But we have yet to learn that the British Government was called upon to regulate the movements of its naval forces by the doubtful or timorous policy of any continental Power. The imaginary ‘compact of Midsummer 1853,’ which Mr. Kinglake has chosen to construct, is a mere trick upon the credulity of his readers*: not only was there no such compact

* In three or four places Mr. Kinglake has printed in inverted commas (as if they were extracts), instructions, compacts, or arguments entirely the product of his own brain. But for their extravagance, an inattentive reader might be misled into supposing them to be authentic statements, and this mode of presenting his own views is certainly reprehensible. (See vol. i. p. 142., and again p. 328., for two of these imaginary pieces.)

‘virtually’ in existence, but it was utterly opposed to the principles on which the Queen’s Ministers were really acting. They were honestly labouring to obtain, as far as possible, the moral concurrence and active support of the German Powers; but a very difficult task it was. Is Mr. Kinglake not aware that during the whole summer and autumn of 1853, the Emperor Nicholas was straining every nerve in the opposite direction, and that he still exerted not only his diplomatic but his personal influence? On the 26th September took place the conference of Olmütz; on the 3rd October the Emperor of Austria and the King of Prussia were at Warsaw; on the 8th October the Czar was at Sans Souci; on the 13th October Austria ordered the reduction of her effective army: several of the lesser German Courts were actively intriguing on the Russian side: others were afraid to offend that powerful State. This was at the very time when the Allied fleets were ordered to enter the Dardanelles. Was the policy and the maritime action of France and England to be suspended until it pleased the plenipotentiaries at Vienna to authorise the advance of their fleets? That indeed would have been to paralyse the Western Powers, and to leave Russia in possession of the field. The truth is, that it was the overbearing policy and attitude of Russia which alone brought France and England into a strict and active alliance.

Mr. Kinglake has misconceived the whole series of causes which led to the successive acts of the British Government. They were steadily determined, not by the importunity and example of France, but by the increasing insolence, menace, and aggression of Russia. Thus: on the 1st March 1853, Prince Menschikoff arrived at Constantinople. In compliance with the entreaties of the terrified Divan, Colonel Rose summoned the fleet from Malta, but Admiral Dundas did not comply with the summons; and the British Government, still choosing to rely, or to manifest its reliance, on the solemn assurance of the Emperor Nicholas that Menschikoff’s mission had no hostile purport to Turkey, approved the Admiral. Indeed, Colonel Rose himself immediately revoked his order. The French Government, on the contrary, sent its fleet to Salamis on the 19th March, without consulting England, a measure for which they afterwards frankly expressed their regret. This indication of a dissension between the Maritime Powers was, of course, rapturously welcomed at St. Petersburg. On the 5th May Prince Menschikoff presented his ultimatum, and on the 22nd May he left Constantinople. On the 31st May, these events being known in London, Lord Clarendon placed the fleet at the

disposal of Lord Stratford, to repair to such places as he might direct in the event of his considering the presence of such a British force absolutely essential to the safety of the Turkish Empire. On the 3rd July the Russians crossed the Pruth; on the 13th July the French Emperor declared to the English Government the French fleet could not longer remain in Besika Bay, and on the 19th August again pressed the English Government to enter the Dardanelles. So says Mr. Kinglake. He is right for once. But what was the answer of the British Government? On the 6th September Lord Clarendon declared that, although any movement of the fleets which should have the character of a retreat was not to be thought of, yet, as the future course of the Allies must, in a great measure, depend upon that of the Emperor of Russia, and as the negotiation on the basis of the Vienna Note was not then finally concluded, *England would take no final decision until the answer came from St. Petersburg*. On the 7th September Russia gave her violent interpretation of the Vienna Note, and on the 17th September England and France finally abandoned that plan of adjustment. On the 20th September Austria declared the Vienna Conference at an end. Then first it was, that on the 23rd September, Lord Clarendon instructed Lord Stratford to call up the fleet.

Upon this measure Mr. Kinglake has put an erroneous and unwarrantable construction. He asserts that it was needless; that it was dictated as a provocation by the French Emperor from a desire to break the treaty of 1841, which closed the Dardanelles in time of peace; and that by Lord Clarendon's 'unlucky' promise to France, and his despatch to Lord Stratford of the same date, the ambassador was deprived of the discretion which had hitherto been used with singular care and wisdom (p. 366). We reply that every one of these charges is not only untrue, but the reverse of the truth. The date of the measure (23rd Sept.) of itself demonstrates that it was taken not upon the demand of the French Emperor (which had twice before been refused) but because by the act of Russia a further step had been rendered inevitable in the opinion of the British Cabinet. It was also taken at the very time when, as has been shown, the German Powers were in separate and intimate communication with the Emperor of Russia. As to the treaty of 1841, England subsequently declared (1st October) that 'the Porte had ceased to be at peace from the moment when the first Russian soldier entered the Danubian Principalities, and that from that moment the Sultan had a right to invite the British squadron into the Straits, and Her Majesty's Government had a right to send the British squadron

'into, and, if necessary, through the Straits.*' Mr. Kinglake subsequently applauds the spirit of this declaration. It is not a question of spirit but of law. If, as we maintain, the Porte had 'ceased to be at peace' after the invasion of the Principalities, the whole of his argument based on the Russian pretext of a violation of the treaty of 1841 falls to the ground.

And, now, what was Lord Clarendon's instruction of the 23rd September, from which Mr. Kinglake extracts *thirteen words*, for the purpose of showing that the discretion of the ambassador was taken away by it?

'Under ordinary circumstances, and as long as the Sultan does not declare war against Russia, nor demand the presence of the British fleet, we must scrupulously observe the treaty of 1841, and your Excellency's original instructions on this matter *remain therefore in full force*. But when it appears that the lives and properties of British subjects are exposed to serious danger, and that the Turkish Government declares itself unable to avert that danger, it is clear that the treaty has no longer a binding force upon us, and that urgent necessity supersedes its provisions. Your Excellency is therefore instructed to send for the British fleet to Constantinople, and, in conjunction with the admiral, to dispose of it in the manner you deem most expedient for protecting British interests, and the personal safety of the Sultan; and her Majesty's Government have no doubt that the Turkish Government will, without hesitation, furnish the necessary firmans for that object.' (*Eastern Papers*, part ii. p. 116.)

It thus distinctly appears, that as long as the Sultan did not declare war and demand the fleet, the original instructions remained in force: the further instruction was eventual and limited; it depended on incidents which had not yet occurred, but were likely to occur, and, in fact, afterwards did occur. Then only did the instruction become imperative, and Lord Stratford was armed with full power to act, just at the moment he required it. This Mr. Kinglake calls 'rushing into the hostile policy 'involved in the stringent order to Lord Stratford;' and he founds upon it a whole series of absurd and inaccurate imputations.

We now arrive at one of the strangest and most important of Mr. Kinglake's inaccuracies, on which much of his reasoning is made to rest. He states (without giving the date), that by the advice of a Great Council the Porte determined on war: that a declaration was issued which made the further continuance of peace dependent upon the evacuation of the Principalities within fifteen days; that this demand was not complied with, and that on the 23rd October, 1853, 'the Sultan

* Earl of Clarendon's Despatch to Baron Brunow, Oct. 1, 1853.

'was placed in a state of war with the Emperor of Russia' (p. 354). Whence Mr. Kinglake argues that all the semi-hostile measures taken before the 23rd October must be regarded as lawless provocations to the amicable disposition of the Czar.

A simple attention to dates would have avoided this misapprehension, but it would have extinguished Mr. Kinglake's theory. The Great Council of the Turks took place on the 26th September, and on that day war was virtually declared. The Manifesto of the Porte and the actual Declaration of War (two distinct documents) bore date the 4th October. After reciting the unanimous decision of the Great Council, the latter document went on thus:—

'As upon these premisses *the state of war is now declared to exist between the two governments (constaté)*, according to custom a written summons is addressed to the Russian commander to demand the evacuation of Moldavia and Wallachia: at the same time an order is sent to his Excellency Omar Pacha *to begin hostilities* if the evacuation has not taken place within fourteen days from the arrival of the summons at its destination.'

War was declared on the 4th October: from that day the state of war existed: if prizes had been taken at sea, they would certainly have been good prizes: but the Turkish general was ordered not to begin hostilities on the Danube, where he was, until after a fourteen days' notice. This is what Mr. Kinglake calls making 'the further continuance of peace depend' on the fourteen days' notice; and hence he infers that the state of war commenced on the 23rd October, very nearly one month after war had been unanimously decreed by the Great Council. This difference is, of course, of the utmost importance in judging of the policy of the Allies in the interval. The fact is, that on the 23rd October, war having been declared on the 4th October, hostilities actually commenced at Isakcha.*

Mr. Kinglake overlooks, or fails to conceive, the force of the two motives which had the strongest influence both on the

* In assigning a date to the commencement of the war between England and Russia, Mr. Kinglake commits another blunder, but in the opposite direction. He says (vol. i. p. 480.) the state of war began on the 19th March, because that was the date on which the notice to Russia expired. But, in fact, the British Order of General Reprisals was dated the 29th March, and it was not till that day that the state of war really began. So that he has post-dated the war between Turkey and Russia, and ante-dated the war between Russia and England.

Allied Governments and on their respective representatives at this critical period. Two dangers were seriously apprehended. The first was, that in the excited state of the Mohammedan population, the Christians might be the victims of a fanatical insurrection; and Lord Stratford loudly complained to the Porte of the 'disorderly and brutal outrages of Mussulman 'fanaticism, excited by cupidity and hatred against the Sultan's 'Christian subjects.' (4th July, 1853.) This apprehension was appeased, as Mr. Kinglake has stated, by the simple measure of calling up to Buyukdéré a couple of steamers. The second danger was even more real, and was considered to be not less imminent. At the time of the Turkish declaration of war, and for three weeks afterwards, Constantinople was defenceless. Three or four ill-manned Turkish line-of-battle ships, moored by Admiral Slade in the fair way of the Bosphorus, were the sole defence of the capital. The Russian fleet, which soon afterwards achieved the exploit of Sinope, could have landed an unopposed army in Beicos Bay, almost as easily as it had done in 1832. Had the blow been struck with secrecy and promptitude, the presence of the allied fleets off Tenedos would certainly not have prevented the catastrophe; for in the allied fleets there were at that time but two line-of-battle ships propelled by steam; the squadron, even with the assistance of its towing power, was afterwards nearly a fortnight in making its way against wind and tide from the Dardanelles to the Bosphorus. Lord Stratford, and the French Ambassador M. de la Cour, and the Austrian Internuncio, were quite alive to this danger; and before Lord Clarendon's instruction of the 23rd September had reached the hands of him, whom Mr. Kinglake delights to call the 'Great Eltchi,' that eminent person was convinced that the time to call up the fleet had arrived, and had determined to issue the order under his anterior instructions.

Mr. Kinglake supposes that the Czar resolved 'to have 'vengeance at sea while vengeance at sea was still possible,' and that orders for active operations were given to the fleet at Sebastopol, when *the hostile resolution of the Western Powers was known to the Czar*, a little before the 14th October. But that was, in truth, exactly the time when the decision of the Grand Council and the Turkish declaration of war became known at St. Petersburg. Mr. Kinglake has, as we have seen, post-dated these events, and then casts upon the Western Powers what was the direct result of the Turkish declaration. He even asserts that the fleets entered the Dardanelles on the 22nd, 'the day before war was declared and the treaty of 1841

'suspended.' But, as we have seen, war had actually been declared just eighteen days before.

The Russian army made no attempt on Constantinople, and even on the Danube the extended line of Russian troops was exposed to attack, without being able to return it, a circumstance which, in fact, threw the assailing party on the defensive and gave a strange character to the war during the ensuing winter months. But the Russian fleet went out and destroyed the Turkish squadron at Sinope. Mr. Kinglake thinks the attack was justified by the usages of war, in spite of Count Nesselrode's positive declaration of the 31st October, that Russia would remain on the defensive and not take the initiative in hostilities. Mr. Kinglake again reserves his censure for the Governments of France and England, which had been weak enough still to place some reliance on the word of Russia, and had, consequently, not instructed their admirals to act. He talks of a chasm in the instructions of the admirals; but in fact they were empowered to act, and some of them thought so. The British Government declared by Lord Clarendon on the 27th December, 'that it was not the Turkish squadron alone that was deliberately attacked in the harbour of Sinope. It was an offence against the Western Powers, which they felt themselves compelled to resent.' Mr. Kinglake asserts that 'the Governments of France and England had omitted to consider the plight in which they would stand, if under the eyes of their naval commanders, a Russian admiral should come out from Sebastopol and crush a Turkish squadron in the midst of the Black Sea.' (Vol. i. p. 375.) Yet only three pages before he had himself quoted Lord Clarendon's positive instructions of the 8th October, that 'if the Russian fleet were to come out of Sebastopol, the fleets would then, as a matter of course, pass through the Bosphorus,' and a discretionary power was given to the ambassadors and admirals to use them as might be most expedient for the defence of the Sultan's territories. The Sultan's territories had clearly been attacked at Sinope. When the news of the action of Sinope reached Therapia great was the irritation of the Turks, and great the indignation of their allies—for the insult was even greater than the injury. A council of the allied diplomatists and admirals was held; and we have reason to believe that it was then and there pointed out by the British officers, that if the allied fleets at once entered the Black Sea and sailed for Sebastopol, they could scarcely fail to intercept and destroy the victorious Russian squadron ere it returned to port. If this bold scheme was not adopted, the

forbearance of the Allies was mainly due to the repugnance of the French ambassador to assume the responsibility of an act of war. Had it been executed, and the Russian fleet destroyed as it were *in flagranti delicto* after Sinope, it would have had an incalculable effect on the whole course of events.

Yet Mr. Kinglake represents the British Government to have been constantly drawn or driven along by another Power, and therefore to have played a secondary and subservient part. The facts and dates we have given, to which many others might be added, appear to us to demonstrate the reverse. England has no call to throw off the responsibility of the measures taken on any other Power. Those measures were taken because they were demanded by her own conception of the duty she had to perform; and by far the largest share of that responsibility rests with this country. We see no reason to deny it; and if the case occurred again, we should see no reason to act with less determination. With singular inconsistency, whilst Mr. Kinglake ascribes to the British Cabinet this mean and unworthy part, he lauds to the skies the wisdom and firmness of the British ambassador. Who sent out Sir Stratford Canning? Who instructed, supported, and approved him? Had the English Ministers been disposed to make concessions of principle to peace, it would have been rational to select a more pliant instrument. As it is, the opposite charge was brought against them by Russia and by the opponents of the war—namely, that they selected the man best fitted and most resolved to oppose the aggressions of the Czar. No man ever took upon himself a larger amount of responsibility than Lord Stratford, when he virtually overruled the decision of the four Powers, including his own Government, and acquiesced in—not to say caused—the rejection of the Vienna Note by the Porte, after it had been accepted by Russia. The interpretation afterwards put upon that Note by Count Nesselrode showed that he was right; but, nevertheless, that was the point on which the question of peace and war turned. We shall not enter into the wearisome detail of the successive diplomatic propositions, because one fatal vice pervaded them all. Russia had formed the design to extort from Turkey, in one form or another, a right of protection over the Christians. She never abandoned that design. She thought she could enforce it. The Western Powers interposed, and the strife began.

Mr. Kinglake lays great stress upon the support which Austria would, in his opinion, have afforded to the Allies. 'Her mere orders to her officer in command of her army of observation would necessarily force the Czar to withdraw his

'troops' from the Principalities: and (in February 1854) 'Austria had plainly resolved to go to war, if the Principalities 'should not be relinquished.' In support of this view a diagram is inserted to show that the Austrian territory so overlaps Wallachia, that the whole line of Russian operations could be cut by an advance on Jassy. But Mr. Kinglake has taken a very imperfect view of the course of Austria's proceedings. On the 3rd of October the Emperor of Austria and the King of Prussia were at Warsaw. At the same time, just when our fleets were going up the Dardanelles, Austria declared her strict neutrality and reduced her army; Prussia supported the propositions of Olmütz. On the 3rd of November Austria proposed to Prussia a joint declaration of neutrality. At every step Russia made in advance, the Western Powers advanced likewise; but the German Powers held back and did not act up to pledges they had given of a complete approval of the policy of England and France. The reason was plain. The Russian kingdom of Poland overlaps Galicia and threatens Moravia to the west, just as much as Transylvania overlaps Little Wallachia to the east. Throughout the war Russia maintained in her western provinces the finest corps of her whole army, the guards and the grenadiers of the first division. Austria felt and believed that if she struck a blow in the East, it would be instantly responded to on her most vulnerable frontier, and unless she could have obtained the support of all Germany, she declined the chances of that contest. The Western Powers obtained from Austria all the aid she was capable of giving, namely, her moral support, which contributed in some measure to the termination of the war, and the diversion of a powerful portion of the Russian army by her attitude. Austria and Prussia recorded in the quadruple note of the 9th of April 1854 (after the declaration of war) their deliberate opinion that France and England were in the right, but they repeatedly refused to bind themselves to any joint action with us against Russia. If then we are asked whether England could have obtained the deliverance of the Principalities by means taken with the rest of the Four Powers, and without resorting to the French alliance, we confidently answer, *no*: because the Emperor of Russia had good reason to believe the German Powers not to be in earnest, and was able to act upon them partly by influence and partly by fear, to which England and France were not accessible. The facts adduced by Mr. Kinglake to prove that Austria was resolved to force Russia to evacuate the Principalities (vol. i. p. 433.) apply to a much later period of the contest, viz., June and July, 1854,

three or four months after war had been declared by the Western Powers, and after the siege of Silistria had actually been raised. Russia did evacuate the Principalities, not because the German Powers threatened her, but because she had been signally beaten on the Danube. All this, however, could have nothing whatever to do with the conduct of the Maritime Powers in September and October, 1853—nine months earlier. Could the German Powers give a greater proof of subserviency to Russia than that in December 1853 their representatives attended the *Trêve* at St. Petersburg for the victory at Sinope? * It is certainly a novel imputation from the pen of an English writer that 'France and England could not bear to wait,' until they got the permission of Austria to announce their policy. The Ministers of England entertained a loftier conception of the rights and duties of the country. But Mr. Kinglake seems to have graduated in some Austrian chancery, and to take his standard of energy from Count Buol. Meanwhile, he accuses the British Cabinet individually and collectively of being too weak—not to act—but to refrain from action: 'they had lost 'their composure:' and were driven like a flock of sheep by the French Emperor, and 'the strong man who was amongst 'them without being of 'them.'

It is not our intention to comment upon the pen-and-ink sketches Mr. Kinglake has thought it right to publish of his contemporaries. They can answer for themselves: they sit opposite to him or near in the House of Commons: they know him as well or better than he knows them; and if they overlook the proceeding we have no reason to complain of it. But with reference to Lord Palmerston, this book contains statements of a more unwarrantable stamp.

Mr. Kinglake describes Lord Palmerston as 'the Minister 'who went his own way;' enjoying a paramount power just when he seemed to enjoy none; 'subordinated to Lord Aberdeen 'in foreign affairs,' yet ruling over him; a man well-fitted to act

* Mr. Kinglake speaks (vol. i. p. 478.) of 'Count Mensdorf's 'shameful presence' at the thanksgivings which the Czar and his people offered up to the Almighty for the slaughter at Sinope. He is quite mistaken. Count Mensdorf was at that time ill, and absent from his post on leave: it was the *Chargé d'Affaires* who attended. More shameful and surprising still is the fact (not mentioned by Mr. Kinglake) that, although M. de Castelbajac, the French Ambassador at St. Petersburg, did not attend the thanksgiving, he sent his congratulations to the Czar, 'as a soldier, a minister, and a Christian.' M. de Castelbajac received the Grand Cordon of St. Alexander Newski, on leaving the Court of Russia in the following spring.

with Louis Napoleon, 'because he had superseded the Bourbons 'and suppressed France,' which, considering the opinions expressed by this writer as to the French Emperor, is, at least, a doubtful compliment; in short, 'the real bridge by which 'French overtures of the more secret and delicate sort would 'come from over the Channel.' For these excellent reasons 'Lord Palmerston as early as the spring of 1853 was the most 'puissant member of Lord Aberdeen's Cabinet,' and at last gained in it 'a complete dominion.' 'He had the skill to 'protrude Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Gladstone, and keep them 'standing forward' as false ensigns and pledges of peace 'in the 'van of a Ministry which was bringing the country into war.' As an example of his skill, we are told that Lord Palmerston resigned in December 1853 and remained out of office twelve days, in order to bring his colleagues to reason and compel them to adopt the French instructions to the admirals after Sinope.

These statements are as offensive as any that can be made against a Minister: but one singularity of Mr. Kinglake's book is that when he is most offensive he seems to be, like his hero the great Eltchi, 'unconscious' of it. He suggests that Lord Palmerston, having joined a cabinet of honourable men, spent a year in betraying them: that his policy was not that of his colleagues for which he was responsible to Parliament, but that of the Tuileries; and that the Home Secretary was the chosen instrument of a foreign despot to sacrifice (for Bonapartist purposes) the true interests of this country. Yet Mr. Kinglake relates all this as if it was the most natural transaction in the world. He must permit us to tell him that such conduct would not only destroy a public man, but would deservedly blast a man's private reputation. And it is the very reverse of the conduct pursued by Lord Palmerston at that period. Having somewhat reluctantly accepted the Home Office under the premiership of Lord Aberdeen, on the especial request of Lord Aberdeen himself and of the Marquis of Lansdowne, Lord Palmerston sought not to take any active or prominent part in the affairs of any other department. From motives of delicacy he confined himself to the business of his own office; and although his experience was not wanting to his colleagues in foreign transactions, he neither aspired openly, nor conspired in secret, to resume the direction of an office he had ceased to hold. Mr. Kinglake has thought fit to attribute to motives connected with the foreign policy of the country after the attack on Sinope the resignation which was tendered by Lord Palmerston in December 1853: we say 'tendered'

because it was not accepted by Lord Aberdeen, it was not laid formally before the Queen, and Lord Palmerston did not cease for a single day to hold the seal, and after some days he himself withdrew his resignation. But Mr. Kinglake is entirely misinformed. So little reason was there for resigning on this question that every Minister of the Crown was ready and eager, on the arrival of the news of the Sinope attack, to adopt the course proposed by the French Government. In reality, the true, and, we believe, the sole, cause of Lord Palmerston's resignation at that crisis was that some members of the Cabinet were then pressing on a measure of Parliamentary Reform which he thought inopportune, and the office which he then held as Home Secretary of course made him peculiarly responsible for an organic measure of internal legislation. This difficulty was surmounted mainly in consideration of the paramount importance to our foreign relations of maintaining the union of the Government. No Minister of this country has ever been more free than Lord Palmerston from the imputation of intriguing against his colleagues or of conspiring to defeat a policy for which he was ostensibly responsible. Mr. Kinglake describes him as the author of a sanguinary war in a cabinet still desirous of peace: and as the close partisan of Imperial France at the sacrifice of the interests and independence of England.

‘Throwing aside with a laugh some papers which belonged to the Home Office, he gave his strong shoulder to the levelling work. Under the weight of his touch the barrier fell. Thenceforth the hinderances that met him were but slight. As he from the first had willed it, so moved the two great nations of the West.’

These oracular words are, however, alike unjust, unfounded, and absurd. Mr. Kinglake appears to utter them as if he were paying a complimentary tribute to the strength of Lord Palmerston's will: but he pays it at the expense of his honour, his patriotism, his fidelity, and his truth.

We now take leave of Mr. Kinglake's survey of the diplomatic transactions which led to the war. We regret that they should have detained us so long—but he has thought fit to devote to them an entire volume. Much of this space is occupied by episodes or epigrams not essential to the narrative, and, as we have seen, many important incidents are not even noticed. It is singular that he should have devoted 110 pages to an overwrought description of the French *coup-d'état* of 1851, when he has not found space for so many important occurrences in 1853. But the principal charge against Mr. Kinglake's first volume is, that his theory of the causes of the war is fundamentally untrue,

his deductions are fanciful, and his narrative incomplete. Let us now turn to the second volume, which is devoted to military operations; and here we confess that we hoped, at first, to find Mr. Kinglake, not only a highly entertaining, but a trustworthy guide. The papers of Lord Raglan might afford some light on facts not yet known to us; and, at any rate, in the relation of military combinations there is less exercise for the fancy than for the understanding. These hopes have not been altogether fulfilled. A civilian finds more to object to in the first volume—a soldier more in the second. We shall not attempt to enter upon the field of technical military criticism, by which, we doubt not, that this book will also be tried; but there are certain broad military principles, applicable to the political objects of a campaign, which are fairly within reach of men claiming no practical knowledge of the art of war.

But Mr. Kinglake, although he has evidently thought a good deal on military subjects, and is perspicuous in his account of the movements of troops, seems never to have given his attention to the strategical principles which determined the whole course of our operations in this war. At any rate, we nowhere find in these volumes any attempt to describe them; and, as scarcely any allusion is made to their existence, we suppose Mr. Kinglake is unconscious of their importance. For example: on the 12th January, 1854, the Emperor Nicholas had to submit to the occupation of the Black Sea by the Allied fleets, and Mr. Kinglake expresses himself as if he thought the Czar very hardly used. But he entirely fails to perceive the strategical effect of this movement on the campaign then going on upon the Danube. During the Turkish war of 1828 the Black Sea was a Russian lake; Admiral Greig's fleet gave the most useful support to the army which operated against Varna, and every kind of supply was forwarded by water from the arsenal of Sebastopol. This important element of military power was entirely wanting to the Russians in 1854. From the moment the Allied fleets closed the Black Sea, the whole Russian transport service had to be carried on by land. Omar Pacha, on the contrary, had his communications open by sea. Therefore, the maritime occupation of those waters, far from being indifferent to armies contending on the Danube, at once turned the balance in favour of the Turks.*

* This argument was used by a writer in this journal on the Campaign of 1854 (Ed. Rev. vol. c. p. 277.); and we beg to refer those of our readers who take an interest in these details to that remarkable paper, for which we were indebted to an officer then compara-

In February 1854, the Russians changed their whole operations, and began to operate against the line of the Danube: this was precisely the moment when the occupation of the Black Sea began to tell against them. Not an allusion to this point can we discover in Mr. Kinglake's narrative.

But this is by no means the only omission of an important strategical combination. The operations, when the Allies perceived that war was inevitable, were as regularly graduated, and as steadily pursued, as the diplomatic measures had been in the preceding period of negotiation; and it may be convenient at once to lay these successive steps before the reader. Thus, after Sinope, the Allied fleets entered the Black Sea, shut up the Russian ports, and cut off the Russian army on the Danube from its marine communications. The first intention of the Allies had been, as we have already seen, to provide for the defence of Constantinople, on the supposition that it might be approached, or the Bosphorus seized, by the enemy. As early as the 16th February, 1854, Lord Clarendon informed the ambassador

‘That a considerable military force was about to be sent to Turkey by England and France, and that it was in contemplation to disembark a portion of these troops in the neighbourhood of the Dardanelles, with the view of obtaining a sure basis of operations against any Russian force which may hereafter move upon Constantinople, or against any direct attack on that city.’

The instructions of the Duke of Newcastle to Lord Raglan, of the 10th April, 1854, pointed out that the first duty of the Allied forces was to prevent by every means in their power the advance of the Russian army on Constantinople; but that, with a view to subsequent operations of an offensive character, it was desirable to collect information as to the means of taking or destroying Sebastopol, as that would be the heaviest blow which could be struck, and a solid guarantee for the maintenance of peace. And here it may be well to remove (though Mr. Kinglake has not done so) the popular misrepresentation that Lord Aberdeen's Government expected to restore peace by a small military demonstration to Malta. No such futile demonstration was ever contemplated by them. Our readers may perhaps be surprised to learn that it was *the French*, and not the British Government, which proposed in the first instance to send out 10,000 French and 5,000 British troops. This proposal was declined by England. The moment war was declared, and the

tively little known, but who has since rendered public services of the first order, and now fills a very high position in Her Majesty's service in India.

resolution taken to send out troops, it was also resolved to send out the whole military force of the country available for foreign service, amounting to about 28,000 men. Steam transports could only be obtained in the first instance for 10,000; that number of men was consequently sent on to Malta, where they landed for a few days until means were provided to convey them to the Bosphorus. Whilst this operation was going on the transports returned to England to fetch the remainder. It is much to be regretted that Mr. Kinglake has omitted all details as to the sailing of the expedition, and has never even stated the strength of the army.*

In February 1854, the Russians adopted a new plan of operations. Prince Paskiewitsch took the command. General Lüders crossed the Danube; and when the Allied troops reached Turkey in April and May, it was no longer a question of defending the Chersonesus or Constantinople from attack, but of affording support to the army under Omar Pacha, then gallantly defending Silistria. For this purpose Lord Raglan and Marshal St. Arnaud consented to move the troops to Bulgaria. At last, on the 21st June, Prince Gortschakoff raised the siege of Silistria, the evacuation of Wallachia began, and, early in August, the Russians recrossed the Pruth. The question then arose which gave an offensive character to the war and took the Allies to the Crimea.

It will hardly be believed, but it is true, that Mr. Kinglake has noticed some of these successive steps in the most cursory manner, and has omitted others altogether, though each of them is an essential link in the history of the war. Thus the whole of the first stage of the operations is dismissed in eight lines—

‘Two engineer officers—Colonel Ardent on the part of France, and Sir John Burgoyne on the part of England—were despatched to Turkey with instructions to report upon the best means of aiding the Sultan to defend his home dominions; and almost at the same time it was agreed between the two Western Powers, that each of them should prepare to send a small body of troops into the Levant.’

Was it beside the purpose of a military historian to state, as the result of this mission, that entrenchments and strong earthworks were thrown up across the Isthmus from the Dardanelles

* The exact number of British troops sent out between February and April 1854, was 22,680; and in July and August, when the Crimean expedition was in preparation, seven more regiments were added, making 6,431 additional troops. On the 9th December 1854, the grand total of the troops sent by this country to the Crimea was 53,096 men.

to the Gulf of Saros? It was to execute these works that the Allied forces first landed at Gallipoli, and, if the aspect of affairs had still been as unpromising as it was when they left England, these lines would have been of the most essential service. They were designed to hold the passage connecting the Sea of Marmora with the Mediterranean by a small force against a powerful enemy. The position was admirably selected for that purpose, and it was impregnable when defended by Powers in command of the sea. Had the Russians struck a prompt and decisive blow at Constantinople, these lines of Gallipoli would still have held them in check. That contingency never occurred. If Massena had never invaded Portugal, the world might never have heard of the lines of Torres Vedras. But, considering that the work was not only planned by Sir John Burgoyne, and approved by Marshal Vaillant, but executed in the following spring, we think the fact was entitled to a place in this history.

Upon the arrival of the generals in Turkey in May, the troops were speedily called up to Constantinople and quartered in or about the great barrack at Scutari, where 22,000 men of British troops were assembled. Mr. Kinglake despises these prosaic details, and he devotes the first chapter of his second volume to some discreditable anecdotes of the detested St. Arnaud and some rhetorical flattery of Lord Raglan. He then proceeds to describe an intrigue for the command of the Allied armies, which Lord Raglan baffled, and that is all. Is Mr. Kinglake unacquainted with the very remarkable circumstances which then determined the movement of the armies, or has he any motive in suppressing them? We cannot tell: but it is certain, although not recorded in this history, that on the 17th May, Lord Raglan in the 'Caradoc,' Marshal St. Arnaud in the 'Berthollet,' and two of the Turkish Ministers, sailed for Varna to hold a council of war with Omar Pacha. What renders this omission more remarkable is that Mr. Kinglake minutely describes some unimportant occurrences which took place on the 13th May, and others on the 4th June, but he omits what took place in the interval. What took place in the interval was that the Allied generals inspected the Turkish army and its positions; they held council with Omar Pacha: and while they were still there, on the 23rd May, Paskiewitsch opened fire on Silistria.

The result of this conference was that, in compliance with the earnest entreaties of Omar Pacha, the Allied generals consented to move their forces to Bulgaria without delay, not for the purpose of advancing to the relief of Silistria, for they were not in a condition to take the field, but for the purpose of

showing that even in the event of the fall of that fortress, Russia would have to dispute the line of the Balkan against 50,000 or 60,000 of the best troops in Europe.

Mr. Kinglake treats with inexpressible contempt a plan formed by Marshal St. Arnaud on the 4th June, for taking up a position in the rear of the Balkan, for which purpose Bosquet's division was already in march for Adrianople. He appears to be entirely unaware that, in the event of the fall of Silistria and Shumla and the occupation by the enemy of the eastern passes leading to Aidos, the presence of a force entrenched at Adrianople had long before been pointed out by very high military authority, as one of the most effectual modes of stopping an invasion of Turkey. 'If,' said Marshal Marmont (no mean guide on such a question), 'If a French and English fleet were to pass the straits of the Dardanelles, and arrive at Constantinople, and if at the same time a corps of 50,000 men of the alliance, Austrians or French, were to take up the position of Adrianople and establish an entrenched camp there, then the Russians would have immense difficulties in dislodging their enemies.* Lord Raglan was right in thinking that the circumstances did not justify this movement, and it was abandoned: but it by no means follows that the proposal was an absurd one. On the 4th June, nobody thought it probable or even possible, that the Russians should utterly fail before Silistria. It was certain that the Allied armies had not the means of 'moving to the front to relieve the place.' Therefore Marshal St. Arnaud proposed to take up a very strong position, which even in the event of the fall of the Danubian fortresses, must have stopped the invader. As it was, there the Allies remained, dying by scores of cholera, almost within hearing of the cannonade at Silistria, but incapable of moving forwards, when happily the Russians failed in their final onslaught, and on the 22nd June, recrossed the Danube. These facts are barely referred to by Mr. Kinglake, though with a touching sympathy for the prowess of his countrymen, he devotes some pages to the gallant exploits of young Butler and young Nasmyth, the voluntary defenders of Silistria.

At this point, however, the invasion of Turkey by Russia ends. Not long afterwards the Russians evacuated the Principalities. Mr. Kinglake thinks that a mere blockade and the intervention of the German Powers must soon have brought the Czar to reason, and he asks, 'How came it to happen, that rejecting the peace which seemed to be thus prepared by the mere course of events, the Western Powers determined to

* See again Ed. Rev. vol. c. p. 283.

‘undertake the invasion Russian province?’ In other words, why did we go to the Crimea at all?

It appears that this would be the place to put the reader in possession of the strategical views of Lord Raglan upon the campaign. Mr. Kinglake boasts that he has had the privilege of examining all Lord Raglan’s papers and correspondence; but as far as we can perceive, in no one instance have these papers served to throw any fresh light on the conduct of the war. Yet at this time, the British Government must have awaited with extreme interest the reports of the commander, who was already on the spot, acting in concert with the French Marshal and the Turkish General. The Russian siege of Silistria had begun: if successful, the army of invasion must ere long have found itself in face of the Allied forces: if defeated, what part remained for the Allied forces to take? This dilemma was so obvious, that Lord Raglan can hardly have failed to consider it; but we are not informed what course he had resolved to adopt in either alternative. On this important question this history is a blank. But it is stated in another place that from the moment Lord Raglan knew that the siege of Silistria had been raised, he never doubted that, for that year at least, the invasion of European Turkey was at an end. And again: ‘After all, it is hard to say what other disposition of the troops [than the Crimean expedition] would have united the advantages of being better and possible.’ Mr. Kinglake admits, therefore, that the invasion of the Crimea was not only the best disposition of the troops, but the only one—a retreat to Malta being obviously impossible.

The siege of Silistria was raised on the 21st June upon the failure of the final assault of the place. What was now to be done? Mr. Kinglake’s opinion is that at that moment ‘the war ceased to be necessary,’ and that ‘it would have been virtually at an end if France had been mistress of herself, or if England had been free from passion and craving for adventure.’ Upon this view of the case the Crimean invasion was unjustifiable; and accordingly Mr. Kinglake proceeds to account for it, not by any large views of politics or of war, but by paltry personal passions and influences of the most contemptible kind. For the whole theory of this ingenious author reminds us in some degree of the paradox of Mandeville, that the world is really governed by the vices and follies of mankind. But his manner of presenting the facts of the case is marvellously incomplete, and his deductions from them are consequently fallacious.

It is necessary to remind our readers, for no trace of the fact appears in these volumes, that in the months of July and

August, when the preparations for the invasion of the Crimea were going on, negotiations with Russia were also carried on by Austria on behalf of herself and the Western Powers. England and France declared by their despatches of the 22nd July, that the sacrifices already imposed upon them were too great, and the cause they had taken in hand too important, for them to desist, unless they obtained from Russia adequate securities against the renewal of hostilities. They therefore demanded,

1. That the Protectorate claimed by Russia over the Principalities by virtue of former treaties, now abrogated, should cease.
2. That the navigation of the mouths of the Danube should be free.
3. That the treaty of 13th July, 1841, should be revised in the sense of a restriction of the naval power of Russia in the Black Sea.
4. That no Power should claim an official protectorate over the Christian subjects of the Porte.

On the 8th August, Austria entirely adopted these principles. Notes were exchanged at Vienna, and on the 10th August, Austria urged Russia to accede to these demands.* Prussia hereupon withdrew, and refused to take a part in this remonstrance. On the 26th August, Russia *positively rejected these terms*. Had they been accepted, it is needless to add that the Crimean expedition would not have taken place. Here then is the clear and precise ground on which the war assumed an offensive character against Russia, viz., to compel her to submit to terms of peace which England and France held to be necessary to the future safety of Turkey, and which Austria had fully adopted. This is the political explanation of the war; and it was justified, as each preceding step of the Allies had been justified, by a fresh refusal on the part of Russia to agree to the terms proposed by the Allies.

Mr. Kinglake, passing by these negotiations and offers in total silence, proceeds to attribute the war solely to the adventurous and fervent passions of the English people, to the artifices of France, to the influence of the newspaper press in this

* In the very teeth of these indisputable facts Mr. Kinglake states (vol. ii. p. 128.), that 'our plan of engaging in a great marine expedition against Crim Tartary would cause Austria and Prussia to despair of all effective support from the West, thus driving them, or tending to drive them, into better relations with Nicholas. Before the 28th July there were signs that this change was beginning to set Russia free from the straits into which she had been placed by the unanimity of the Four Powers.' As far as Austria was concerned the very reverse was the case, as is demonstrated by her note of the 8th August, and by her declaration that she approved the moderation of our conditions.

country, and to the torpor of the British Cabinet at a dinner at Pembroke Lodge. These are absurdities alike unworthy of the historian of this war, and of his subject. The passions of the English people were not so excited that they would not have desisted from war, if they could then have obtained adequate and lasting guarantees of peace. France had not more to do with those conditions than Austria, which had adopted them. Mr. Kinglake has drawn a fanciful picture of a great English newspaper, under the figure of a 'Company' exercising 'a great 'sway over the conduct of the war.' We know not whether the 'Times' newspaper belongs to a 'Company' at all, and we very much question the fact. But if 'widows and country gentlemen' have any share in the profits of that journal, it may be presumed that these persons have not more influence over its political direction, than the individual shareholders of a railway company have over the express trains upon the line. It is within our certain knowledge that the articles to which Mr. Kinglake refers were simply the expression of the strong convictions of one or two political writers, who had in view no object but the public interests they had undertaken to defend; and that the paltry motives here ascribed to them had not one particle of influence on the course they took in that great discussion. They have reason to look back on that course with unmixt satisfaction; for whatever may have been the subsequent mistakes of those by whom this expedition was carried on, the invasion of the Crimea was demonstrated by the result to be the true grand strategical operation which exhausted the whole power of Russia, and finally led her to abandon all her pretensions and conclude peace.

Nor can it be forgotten that all the reasons which existed in the summer of 1854 for the attack on Sebastopol were augmented a hundredfold, when it was discovered (as it was in the course of the following year) what enormous stores the Czar had accumulated in that arsenal for the subjugation of the East. That fact, coupled with the conversations with Sir Hamilton Seymour, the Menschikoff mission, the insults to Turkey, the claim of the Protectorate, and the seizure of the Principalities, conclusively demonstrates the depth and magnitude of the design of Nicholas, and that design was, by the ultimate capture and destruction of Sebastopol, annihilated. The Crimean War could not infuse any real strength into Turkey, but it took from Russia the power of injuring her. In point of fact, long before the public attention had been directed to Sebastopol by any English newspaper, the Duke of Newcastle had distinctly informed Lord Raglan in his despatch of the 10th April,

1854, that Sebastopol was the point against which effective operations, when they commenced, should be directed. To that Minister, who had afterwards to bear so much of the obloquy which might more justly have been thrown on others, belongs the merit of having energetically adopted this policy at the outset of the war. We do not believe that he stood alone in it. Indeed, the unanimous decision of the Cabinet is a sufficient answer to that charge; though we may here remark, in answer to Mr. Kinglake's former extravagant estimate of Lord Palmerston's influence, that the Home Secretary was not present at the Cabinet which finally decided on the expedition. At length, when the time for action arrived, the Duke of Newcastle, as Minister of War, proceeded of course to communicate to Lord Raglan the views of the Government. He did so in a despatch which was read to the Cabinet after a dinner at Pembroke Lodge, and Mr. Kinglake has here amused his readers with a whimsical anecdote. He relates that all the members of the Cabinet, except a small minority, fell asleep. As the whole despatch consists of about one hundred and fifty lines, and might be read in fifteen minutes, their slumbers cannot have been long. But even if the incident be truly stated, it had no effect on the result. The decision had previously been deliberately taken in the Cabinet after repeated discussions; the despatch was merely the formal document conveying it to Lord Raglan. Mr. Kinglake assails this despatch with great unfairness and acrimony: he says that 'it bristled with sentences tending to provoke objections;' and implies that it would or should have been 'mutilated' by an awakened Cabinet. As he publishes, or affects to publish, the despatch itself, readers can judge for themselves. We say, moreover, with the *whole* despatch before us, that it appears to us to be open to no objections at all. Mr. Kinglake rashly asserts that the cogency of the wording of it placed the English general under compulsion. We find in it direct evidence of the contrary. After referring to the previous instructions of the 10th April, which had pointed to Sebastopol at the very outset of the war, whenever it should assume the shape of offensive hostilities, and after showing that the other contingencies of the campaign were already exhausted, the Duke of Newcastle instructed Lord Raglan 'to concert measures for the siege of Sebastopol, *unless*, with the information in your possession, but at present unknown in this country, *you should be decidedly of opinion that it could not be undertaken with a reasonable prospect of success.*' And he added, that 'if, upon mature reflection, you should consider the united strength of the two armies is insufficient for this undertaking, *you are not*

'to be precluded from the exercise of the discretion originally vested in you.' We entirely deny that this was 'an absolute order from the Secretary of State.' It was exactly such an order as a Government must give in the discharge of its duty; it is such an order as strengthens a commander to act, but at the same time it left him to judge in the last resort whether he had the means of obeying it. But there are things yet more singular with reference to this despatch. Mr. Kinglake publishes a portion of it (vol. ii. p. 106.) introduced with the words, 'so far as it related to the expedition which the Allies undertook, the promised despatch was in these words;' and as the document is headed 'Secret,' and a portion of it is barred with mysterious asterisks, Mr. Kinglake's readers may perhaps imagine that he is at last breaking the seal of the Raglan papers and introducing them to a secret of state. But this would be a delusion. When on the 23rd April, 1855, the Duke of Newcastle was examined by the Sebastopol Committee of the House of Commons, His Grace, by the express desire of the Committee, produced *in their entirety* both the despatch to Lord Raglan of the 10th April, and also that of the 29th June. Both these documents are printed *in extenso* in the Evidence taken before that Committee, Part ii. p. 116.; and it is certainly unaccountable that Mr. Kinglake should not have referred to a source of information which must be familiar to him. But this is not all. The historian of the Crimean War ought to have printed both those despatches, on which the expedition was founded, fully and completely in his Appendix. Instead of that he has inserted a mutilated copy of one of them in his text. We say mutilated, because the omissions are by no means unimportant. They relate to the design for seizing the isthmus of Perikop to prevent the Russians from throwing troops into the Crimea, and also to operations in Georgia in the event of the delay being inevitable in undertaking the expedition against Sebastopol. An alternative was, therefore, presented to Lord Raglan in the very despatch which Mr. Kinglake represents as an absolute command.

Mr. Kinglake's account of the manner in which Lord Raglan received this despatch is still more extraordinary. He tells us that the General believed that the enterprise was one of a very hazardous kind, and was not warranted by any 'safe information concerning the state of the enemy's forces.' Nevertheless, he resolved not to exercise his discretion, but to obey it. Not that Lord Raglan thought that the order was simply imperative, for he took Sir George Brown's opinion on the subject. These two gallant officers asked themselves 'how the Great Duke

‘ would have acted and decided under such circumstances.’ Sir George Brown thought ‘ that great man *would not* have accepted ‘ the responsibility of undertaking such an enterprise : ’ but he added, ‘ if you decline it, they will send some one else out to ‘ command the army.’ After this military council, Lord Raglan decided, as we are told by his historiographer, in direct opposition to his own judgment ; and we feel bound to add, that having so decided, it was mainly to his firmness and courage that the landing of the expedition was due. We heartily rejoice that the wording of the despatch was sufficiently clear to produce this result.

Mr. Kinglake repeatedly asserts that the expedition was undertaken without sufficient knowledge of the difficulties attending it, and of the strength of the enemy in the Crimea. But, although it is true that very little information had been obtained by the generals in the East, yet the British Government had exerted itself to the utmost to ascertain the true state of things in the Crimea, and had succeeded to such an extent that the strength and distribution of the Russian forces in the peninsula was accurately known to them, as the result afterwards proved, and Mr. Kinglake admits. The whole of this information was transmitted to Lord Raglan before he was called upon to take the final determination. It is true that this information was all obtained in England, and none of it was collected by Lord Stratford and Lord Raglan. Whose fault was that ? The motive assigned by Mr. Kinglake for this surprising omission is thus expressed :—

‘ The duty of gathering knowledge by clandestine means is one so repulsive to the feelings of an English gentleman, that there is always danger of his neglecting it or performing it ill. Perhaps no two men could be less fit for the business of employing spies than Lord Stratford and Lord Raglan.’ (Vol. ii. p. 90.)

If Mr. Kinglake is acquainted with the despatches of the Duke of Wellington, he will find in them abundant evidence that our greatest commander—an English gentleman also in his way—never neglected any means of obtaining the best information he could from secret political and military sources. It is, in fact, one of the most important duties of a general. The neglect of it in this instance, when some knowledge of the Crimea might certainly have been collected from the Greek traders, was unpardonable.

Mr. Kinglake stands in this singular position. He condemns as unwise the policy of the campaign he has undertaken to describe ; and, in order to exalt the judgment of Lord Raglan, he represents him as carrying through, by the force of his own

will and authority, an expedition which he believed to be 'not even moderately prudent.' If the view taken by Mr. Kinglake be the true one, surely the wisdom and moral courage of the French officers who remonstrated against the expedition would contrast favourably with the rash and adventurous spirit in which it was executed. We who believe that the expedition to the Crimea was a wise and necessary operation, can with greater sincerity rejoice that the 'timides avis' were overruled. The honour of overruling them rests with Lord Raglan, Sir Edmund Lyons, Admiral Bruat, and Colonel Trochu. Oddly enough, whilst he accuses the English Government of fettering the judgment of Lord Raglan by a despatch, Mr. Kinglake discovers (vol. ii. p. 113.) that, 'in effect, the power of deciding for or against the expedition had passed from Paris and from London, and was all concentrated in the English General.' What, then, becomes of the 'absolute orders' of the Secretary of State?

We cannot attempt, within our present limits, to criticise minutely the military details of this great operation as related by Mr. Kinglake. They would require an amount of space we are unable to give to them, and an amount of military experience we do not possess; and we doubt not that this part of the task will be more fully performed by other writers in this country and in France. The latter half of Mr. Kinglake's second volume appears to us to be the most spirited and interesting portion of the book. It is still pervaded, we regret to observe, by a tendency to depreciate the conduct of our allies, which is unworthy of a writer in Mr. Kinglake's position, and not less unfounded than the imputation urged by vulgar and ignorant writers on the other side of the Channel—that the English were always behind-hand in the concerted movements of the two armies. But without engaging in a discussion on this subject, we shall content ourselves with following the personal conduct of Lord Raglan during the three eventful days which ended by placing the Allied armies victorious on the heights of the Alma.

Late on the evening of the 19th September, the British army, bivouacking around the village of Bulganak, not without fear of a sudden attack of the enemy, Marshal St. Arnaud, accompanied by Colonel Trochu, rode up to Lord Raglan's headquarters to concert a plan of attack for the following day. Scornfully as Mr. Kinglake is pleased to treat this overture from such a man as St. Arnaud to such a man as Lord Raglan, it appears to us to be the most natural and rational step that could be taken under the circumstances. A few days before,

Lord Raglan had declared to the Marshal in a French letter, quoted by Mr. Kinglake (p. 149.), that on reaching the rendezvous the generals would have an opportunity of showing that their manner of acting together remained unaltered and sincere: now was the time to put that union and sincerity to the test. St. Arnaud proposed his plan. Perhaps it was not a good one; but what says Mr. Kinglake of Lord Raglan's reception of it?

Lord Raglan, cast in another mould, sat quiet, with governed features, restraining—or only perhaps postponing—his smiles, listening graciously, assenting, or not dissenting, putting forward no plan of his own, and, in short, eluding discussion. This method was instinctive with him; but in his intercourse with the French he followed it deliberately and upon system . . . Of a certainty Lord Raglan dealt as though he held it to be a clear gain to be able to avoid intrusting the Marshal with a knowledge of what our army would be likely to undertake; but my belief is that this, his seemingly guarded method, was not so much based upon anything which may have come to his ears from Paris or from the French camp, but rather upon his desire to avoid premature controversy and upon his true native English dislike of all premature planning. He was so sure of his troops, and so conscious of his own power to act swiftly when the occasion might come, that although he was now within half a march of the enemy's assembled forces, he did not at all long to ruffle his mind with projects—with projects for the attack of a position not hitherto reconnoitred.' (Vol. ii. p. 241.)

This is, we think, the most absurd passage we remember to have read in all historical composition. What! the pupil of Wellington, commanding only a portion of an allied army, which was on the next morning to attack a powerful enemy in a strong position, refuses 'to ruffle his mind with projects,' and, when asked by the French Commander to discuss with him the plan of the attack, he takes refuge in unmeaning grimaces and holds his tongue! If such was the conduct of Lord Raglan, it would be difficult to carry folly and insincerity beyond it. Conceive the Duke of Wellington, in a conference with Blücher before the battle of Waterloo, refusing to 'intrust the Marshal with 'a knowledge of what our army would be likely to undertake'! How are concerted operations between commanders of equal rank possible, if they do not communicate to each other their intentions, and act upon them? It would appear, on Mr. Kinglake's own showing, that if Lord Raglan vouchsafed no further explanation than this, St. Arnaud was entitled to suppose that he did not reject the French proposal. At any rate, Mr. Kinglake is guilty of unnecessary discourtesy when he engraves upon his copy of the French 'Projet' that it was '*untruly stated* to have

'been accepted by Lord Raglan.' The French officers may well have conceived that Lord Raglan acquiesced in it. It is, however, certain that when the Allies found themselves in front of the Russian army, St. Arnaud's plan was impracticable.

But, after all, does it appear from this book, or from any other evidence, that Lord Raglan had formed any plan of attack at all? We have already remarked on the strange absence of evidence of any strategical design after the raising of the siege of Silistria; still more strange is the absence of any definite tactics as he approached the enemy's position at the Alma. Yet again Mr. Kinglake throws no light on the subject. The generals of division were not consulted or informed of their chief's intentions the evening before; they received no definite or precise orders on the morning of the battle. Lord Raglan made up his mind (perhaps wisely) not to attempt to turn the enemy's right, but to attack in front. Thereupon every man knew that the Russians being before our lines, nothing remained for it but to advance by sheer fighting. Even in taking up the ground of the divisions, for want of a timely order, which Lord Raglan refused to give lest he should wound the sensitive feelings of Sir George Brown, the right regiment of the Light Division was masked by a portion of Pennefather's brigade. It is here due to Mr. Kinglake to remark that he has considerably improved our knowledge of the battle by the use of Russian authorities, which are apparently trustworthy. We leave the military critics to deal with the assertion that the earlier operations of the French were ineffectual, and that the Allies were for some time in danger. The dramatic effect of Mr. Kinglake's composition would be marred, if any but Lord Raglan in his own person was to bear off the honours of the victory.

After describing with great animation the first attack on the Great Redoubt, and the heroic, but abortive, efforts of Codrington and Lacy Yea at the head of the Light Division to hold the redoubt and to stem the advance of the Vladimir column, Mr. Kinglake suddenly points to the 'spell which bound the Czar's commanders, and bade them throw away the gifts of fortune. It was nothing less than an apparition.' On one of the high knolls jutting up from the eastern slopes of the Telegraph Hill, and *closely overlooking the Russian reserves*, sat a gay-looking group of horsemen. And amongst them was no less a person than the Commander-in-Chief of the British army. No sooner had Lord Raglan despatched the order to his leading divisions to advance, than he himself, without waiting to support the movement, rode forward across the river, 'guided

'only by Fortune,' being then entirely parted from his own troops. His charger, rejoicing in the appropriate name of 'Shadrach,' became excited in the fire; and Lord Raglan himself is described by his admiring follower, in this critical moment of a general action, 'as under the guidance of feelings 'akin to the impulses of the chase.' Thus led, he dashed onwards, and actually passed with his staff 'between the 'enemy's centre and his left wing,' in the middle of the action. He luckily gained this knoll, 'where Fortune, still enamoured of 'his boldness, was awaiting him with her radiant smile.' Once there, he had the judgment to send back for two guns and for Adams' brigade; and luckily, as the Russians seem to have taken him for a ghost, no serious attempt was made to dislodge the party from the height.

Is it possible that Mr. Kinglake does not perceive the extreme absurdity of this singular anecdote? The British General, relinquishing necessarily all direction over his own troops, then fiercely engaged, rides forward to a point, which is indicated in the plan of the battle by a star, actually in the rear of the Russian line and fronting their reserves; and from this unprecedented position he strikes mortal terror into a whole army, and routs them with a couple of nine-pounders, from which two shots were fired!

With incomparable naïveté Mr. Kinglake adds: —

'It was Lord Raglan's strange and happy destiny to have ridden almost into the rear of the position, as to be almost as near to the enemy's reserves as he was to the front of their array.' (Vol. ii. p. 385.)

We are informed, on the contrary, by one of the staff officers nearest to Lord Raglan's person throughout the day, that he crossed the river immediately after he had ordered the attack, and that on reaching the knoll he expressed his regret that he had taken up a wrong position, and was on the right of his army, when he ought to have been on the left of it.

They reached the knoll just before the Light Division began its attack: there the English General sat aloft watching the fate of the day, but aware that 'any order he might send would lose 'its worth in the journey and tend to breed confusion.' This Mr. Kinglake calls shortly afterwards 'the spirit in which Lord 'Raglan was conducting the battle:' for 'he looked and spoke 'like a man who had the enemy in his power.' We can only say, that if this account be true, the battle was left to the courage and intelligence of the generals of the divisions, and Lord Raglan's share in it was a romantic accident. At that very

point of time, as we learn in another place, the fate of the battle turned on bringing up the supports to the Light Division, and Mr. Kinglake comments, we think with undue severity, on the momentary hesitation of the illustrious Duke, who paused, not from any want of resolution in himself, but from a natural and honourable feeling of consideration for his men. Whose business was it to direct the advance of corps to conduct or support the main attack? It was the duty of the Commander-in-Chief. In his absence from his proper post, the necessary order was given to the First Division by General Airey, and the same movement was spontaneously made by General Evans without any orders at all. Indeed it appears from a letter of General Evans to the Duke of Cambridge, which has been circulated since the publication of this book, that this General induced Colonel Steele to give an order, purporting to come from the Commander-in-Chief, for the advance of the First Division; and a similar order is said to have been sent by Lord Raglan. The Duke of Cambridge and his staff have no recollection of the receipt of those orders. Such was the confusion to which the absence of the Commander-in-Chief gave rise. Mr. Kinglake sneers with his usual taste at the position taken by Marshal St. Arnaud during the action; but that position seems to be precisely the point from which his orders could most easily reach the several divisions of the French army. No censure has yet been cast upon Lord Raglan in the records of this war so severe as Mr. Kinglake's narrative of the battle of the Alma, and for the love and reverence we bear to his memory we deeply regret it. Never was a battle so unscientifically fought: fortunately for the Allies; the Russian generals made even more fatal blunders than our own, and the indomitable pluck of the troops carried the day.

Yet one point more. Mr. Kinglake affirms that the extravagant accounts given by M. de Bazancourt and others of the fight between the French and Russians at the Telegraph Hill are not only exaggerated but fictitious: that the Russians themselves do not claim the merit of any fighting on that spot; and that in fact no combat at all took place there. It is certain that the part taken by the French in the whole action is infinitely less than we were led to suppose at the time, as may be inferred from the fact stated in St. Arnaud's despatch that they lost three officers killed, we lost twenty-five officers and nineteen sergeants killed, and eighty-one officers and 102 sergeants wounded. But the statement that there was no combat on Telegraph Hill is contradicted by very direct evidence. Mr. Kinglake himself admits that there was to

every eye 'the appearance of a fight,' and is obliged to resort to the supposition that the young French soldiers were firing at nothing from sheer excitement. But on the following day Captain Hamley of the Artillery, then adjutant to Colonel Ducre's batteries, visited the spot, and has published what he saw there.

'It was not till reaching the plain on which stood the unfinished signal tower, already mentioned as the contested point in the French attack, that there appeared signs of a sanguinary conflict. Many Russians lay dead there, and they lay thicker near the signal tower, the hillock on which it was built being strewn with them. Three or four had been bayoneted while defending the entrance; and in the narrow space within, which was divided into compartments, were three or four small groups, slain in the defence. Another spot near contained three or four hundred corpses.' (*Hamley's Campaign of Sebastopol*, p. 36.)

Either Captain Hamley did not see what he declares himself to have seen, or Mr. Kinglake's inferences from the Russian narratives of the battle are untrue. Captain Hamley's statement is corroborated by the officer who was sent by Lord Raglan to urge the French to advance, and who informs us that on arriving at the Telegraph Hill, immediately after the combat, he saw many bodies of the slain of both armies.

We now take our leave of this book, with great regret that its defects preponderate so largely over its beauties and its merits, but with a very strong conviction that animation of style and keenness of satire cannot extenuate the perversion of history. Mr. Kinglake had the good fortune to appropriate the most important and heroic subject of our times; he has degraded it sometimes into a libel, sometimes into a caricature. He had the advantage of some personal knowledge of the men and the events he describes; but his personal experience chiefly manifests itself in the shape of invincible antipathies or prepossessions. He intended, no doubt, to raise a monument to the glory of England, but he has defaced it by injustice to France. For these reasons we are satisfied that the country cannot accept this book as the fitting and lasting record of the Crimean war in English literature; but will rather deplore that the fruits of great talent and labour have been marred by a greater lack of temper and judgment.

'Some hand more calm and sage
The leaf must fill.'

ART. II.—*The Odyssey of Homer, translated into English Verse in the Spenserian Stanza.* By PHILIP STANHOPE WORSLEY, M.A., Scholar of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Two volumes. Edinburgh and London: 1861–2.

THE completeness of the *Odyssey* stands out in singular contrast with the broken and almost disjointed design of the *Iliad*. The reader who has carefully studied these poems in the original may feel that both are equally marvellous in strength of thought and power of expression; but he cannot fail to see that the tale, which professes to tell of the wrath of Achilles, leaves both the hero and his anger unnoticed through no small part of the story. And if some refuse to draw from this fact the inference which, in the judgment of Mr. Grote, seems to follow irresistibly, none will hesitate to admit that, after all, the whole *Iliad* is a mere episode in a long and eventful strife. It begins with the tenth year of the war: it ends before its close: and only a casual warning betokens the fate which is in store for the slayer of Hector. But if in the *Odyssey*, as in the *Iliad*, there is much which is not essential to the thread of the story, and which, but for the necessities of oral tradition, would never have been introduced, still the structure of the tale is, throughout, eminently coherent. The adventures of Odysseus might be diminished in number; but the double chain of events in his own history and in that of his wife and kinsfolk unites the whole poem by links which cannot be disturbed, and imparts to it an interest rising steadily in intensity from the beginning to the close. The *Iliad* leaves the wrongs of Helen unrequited; but with the avenging of Penelope the story of Odysseus is ended.

The translation of such a poem should leave most prominently on the reader's mind the impression of this thorough unity. It should be itself a poem which shall carry him on from one part to another with the freshness of an untold tale, and come to him with something of that magic power which it had when sung by rhapsodists before Achæan hearers. There may yet remain questions of critical scholarship and accurate rendering; but if the translator has produced a work which, having caught the spirit of the poem, can delight those to whom the original is a sealed book, he can desire no higher praise: and this praise belongs justly to Mr. Worsley. As far as he could do so under the trammels of an intricate rhyming stanza, he has given faithfully the mind of the old heroic poet, while the infusion of

modern thought is far less in degree than might have been looked for in any but a literal or line-for-line translation.

But is not the merit of a translation to be tested by the measure in which it approaches a literal rendering? The jaws of Scylla and the cavern of Charybdis seem to gape before those who are bold enough to hazard an answer to this question. The love of Homer has grown strong in English scholars, and of late we have seen its fruits in a multitude of translations, which come thick as falling leaves in autumn. We have new translations in blank verse, in ballad metres of various forms, in hendecasyllables, in Spenserian stanza. The theory of one translator is utterly at variance with that of another; and a controversy almost amusing in its vehemence is lost in the mysteries of poetcraft. But it is no part of our design to indulge in dark sayings or angry words. The fight resembles much the battle of the knights who had each seen but one side of the brazen and silver shield.

In truth, the question resolves itself into the very simple inquiry why translations should be made at all. A poet (for a good translator of poetry must be such) will not go through years of toil to smooth the path of boys at school who quarrel with the niggardly help of grammars and lexicons. It is scarcely more likely that he will do his work simply to win the praise of scholars who are familiar with the poem which he is translating. The Oxford Professor of Poetry believes that the merit of a translation depends on the degree in which it reproduces for a competent scholar the effect of the original. Mr. Worsley rightly insists that the translator who works with such a motive is almost sure to fail. He is writing with a personal interest; he is seeking the homage of critics, not that simple admiration of the unlearned which Odysseus bestowed on the lays of Demodocus. His task should be to fill himself with the poet's spirit, and in the fulness of that spirit to write, as he wrote, for the people. He must, of course, know that the critic will give judgment on his work; but he need not shrink from it. The scholar may fairly decide how far the translation approaches the original in its general rhythm, in careful rendering, and, above all, in the exclusion of forms of expression which belong to the thoughts of another age. If the poet is everywhere simple, the philosophy of modern times must find no place in the translation, even if it clothes itself in language clear as that of Tennyson. The scholar may determine how far these conditions have been fulfilled, and from this he may also judge in some degree how far the translation is likely to affect the reader as the original has affected himself; but the im-

pressions of both, in Mr. Arnold's words, 'are like those lines we read of in Euclid, which, though produced ever so far, can never meet.' In thorough strictness of speech, the original cannot be reproduced for either, and, least of all, for the scholar. Probably, on no two minds does a picture or a poem leave the same impression. The words which to one convey a subtle irony, may carry with them no such hidden meaning for another. That may appear grand to one which to another seems commonplace; and, to all alike, the loss of the original language and the original rhythm will be felt to be irreparable. But there remains the temptation to suppose that, if anything like the impression which is left on the scholar is to be produced on the unlearned reader, it must be done by preserving the form of the poem as well as its substance; and a theory of translation springs up, which imposes the closest practicable adherence to the metrical cadence of the original. Dean Alford's version of the '*Odyssey*' is a marvel of literal accuracy; and it has been produced in obedience to this theory, of the truth of which he thinks that there is no longer any question. In his opinion, the English metre ought to be such as may allow the original to be rendered line for line, and the often-recurring epithets and formulæ to retain their places. It is quite certain that the Spenserian stanza will not admit of this; it is not so certain that a version in this metre will not please the English reader better, and fill him with the true Homeric spirit more, than the hendecasyllables of the Dean of Canterbury. The stanza of Spenser must interfere with the Homeric order; it must introduce recurring pauses where there are none in the original. On the insulation of the lines in Homer too much stress has probably been laid; but a more serious fault in the Spenserian metre is that it compels the translator to introduce much that is not found in Homer at all. It is no slight merit if, under such conditions, he is nowhere led into bombast, and, still more, if the matter so introduced is everywhere Homeric in its spirit. Mr. Worsley deserves this praise more, perhaps, than any translator who has not avoided the danger by fettering himself after the manner of Dean Alford. His work is throughout free from affectation; and, therefore, we suppose it is written in that 'grand style' which, in the judgment of Mr. Arnold, is the preeminent characteristic of Homer. Mr. Arnold's watch-words have become a war-cry; but we do not intend to mingle in the strife, except to question, not the manner of Homer, but his matter. A controversy, which almost became virulent, might have been avoided by the use of a few clear words. There is such a thing as the poetical sense, and it is quite true

that, without this sense, 'the critic simply beats the air.' It cannot be imparted to him — it cannot be defined; yet its presence constitutes the distinction between good and bad translation. But it would seem that Mr. Arnold was only puzzling his adversaries when he said that Homer wrote 'only in the 'grand manner,' that he 'never rose or sank with his subject, 'was never prosaic or low.' On this he insisted with the earnestness of a confessor who could only warn those who saw not with his eyes that they should 'die in their sins.' But the mystery is easily cleared up. It is the subject of Homer which rises and sinks, not his manner; and when he wrote —

ὥτρυνεν δὲ ἕκαστον ἐπιοιχόμενος ἐπιέσσειν,
Μέσθλην τε Γλαῦκόν τε, Μέδοντά τε Οερσίλοχόν τε,

he was writing 'very good poetry indeed, poetry of the best 'class in that place.'* In other words, he expressed everything as it ought to be expressed, and with the utmost simplicity. Probably no one will care to gainsay this verdict, although some may be at a loss to know why Mr. Arnold did not say so at first. We are not bound to follow him in the belief that the matter of Homer never sinks below the level of poetry. The question involves points of the deepest interest; but they lead us into the regions of historical criticism into which we can not enter now.

A slight comparison of Mr. Worsley's translation with that of Dean Alford will show that in one sense he has chosen the easier task. He has taken the likeliest course to produce a pleasing poem; but it is not the less clear that by the side of Dean Alford's version his own seems almost a paraphrase. We may take his description of 'the lotus-eating realm':—

'Anon we step forth on the *dear* mainland,
And draw fresh water *from the springs*, and there
Seated *at ease along the silent strand*,
Not far from the swift ships our meal prepare.
Soon having tasted of the *welcome* fare,
I with the herald brave companions twain
Sent to explore what manner of men they were,
Who, on the *green earth couched beside the main*,
Seemed ever with *sweet* food *their lips* to entertain.'

The expressions in italics are not found in the original, and the necessities of his metre have led him to miss the meaning of the line:—

οὔτινες ἀνέρες εἶεν ἐπὶ χθονὶ σῆτον ἔδοντες.

* Last Words on translating Homer. (P. 29.)

Odysseus is not describing the method of their feasting; he simply wishes to know, as Dean Alford turns it, 'what were the 'race upon that land subsisting?' The translation is still more lax in the following stanzas:—

'Thence we sailed onward, overwhelmed in heart,
And to the land of the Cyclopes came,
An undiscerning people, void of art
In life, and trampers on the sacred claim
Of laws which men for civil uses frame.
Scorners of commonweal no bounds they keep,
Nor learn with labours the rude earth to tame;
Who neither plant nor plough, nor sow nor reap;
Still in the gods they trust, still careless wake and sleep.

'There all good fruits on the spontaneous soil,
Fed by the rain of Zeus, for ever grow;
Unsown, untended, corn and wine and oil
Spring to their hand: but they no councils know,
Nor justice, but for ever lawless go.
Housed on the hills, they neither buy nor sell,
No kindly offices demand or show;
Each in the hollow cave where he doth dwell
Gives law to wife and children as he thinketh well.'

Eleven lines, as in the original, suffice for Dean Alford:—

'Thence we sailed onward, grieving in our spirits,
And to the shore of the haughty lawless Cyclops
We came, who, trusting to the gods immortal,
Plant with their hands no plant, nor tillage practise:
But all things grow unsown, and without ploughing,
Barley, and wheat, and vines, which bear abundant
Wine from their bunches,—all by heaven's rain nourished.
Laws have they none, nor counselling assemblies,
But on the heads of lofty mountains dwell they,
In caverns smooth: each rules unfettered over
His wife and children, and for other cares not.'

For English readers the description becomes more attractive by the touches which are introduced by Mr. Worsley. The scene rises before us as we read—

'There a white waterfall beneath the cave
Springs forth and flashes at the haven head:
Round it the whispering alders darkly wave.'

But Homer only says, in Dean Alford's words—

'And at the harbour's head runs limpid water,
A fountain from a cave: and round grow poplars.'

It is needless, however, to dwell on a fault (if fault it be after all) which runs through the whole translation. They who have

not read the Greek cannot feel as a defect insertions of which they are unconscious; and as long as the words or sentences introduced agree generally with the thought and language of Homer, they are rather indebted to the translator for touches which to them must heighten the effect of the picture.

The burial of Achilles, as related to the shade of the hero by the ghost of Agamemnon, is a magnificent passage forcibly translated; but the needs of the Spenserian metre have somewhat marred its strength, as in the noble lines —

σὺ δ' ἐν στροφάλειγγι κοινή
κεῖσο μέγας μεγαλωστί, λελασμένος ἵπποσυνάων.

The words of Voss —

‘Du lagst im Gewirbel des Staubes
Gross, auf grossem Bezirk, der Wagenkunde vergessend,’

are at once more vigorous and faithful than those of Mr. Worsley:—

‘Careless of thine old car-mastery,
Thou, where the dust whirled eddying to and fro,
A great man, large in death, wast mightily lying low.’

It looks, again, almost like affectation to say that the ashes of Achilles, ‘mounded over with a glorious tomb,’ were buried ‘on ‘a beard of shore.’ Homer has simply ἀκτὴ ἐπὶ προυχούσῃ, and Voss follows him in speaking only of a mighty cairn —

‘Am vorlaufenden Strande des breiten Hellespontos.’

But the following stanzas which close the colloquy of Odysseus with the shade of his mother Anticleia, are fairly Homeric and thoroughly beautiful. To the question of Odysseus as to the cause of her death, she answers that it was:—

‘Love, my child, that cut my heart in twain,
Thy love, thy dream’d sweetness, night and day,
Made bitterness my bread, and rest my soul away.

‘Therewith she ended, and a deep unrest
Urged me to clasp the spirit of the dead,
And fold a phantom to my yearning breast.
Thrice I essayed with eager hands outspread,
Thrice like a shadow or a dream she fled,
And my palms closed on unsubstantial air.
Then was I whelmed in disappointment dread,
Stern calamity, more quick despair;
And sadly in winged words I spake appealing there:

“Ah! mine own mother, tell me, tell me why
Thou scornest to abide my fond embrace.
Could we but clasp each other feelingly,

Even in Hades might we yet find place
 To slake our sorrows and enjoy long space
 Of weeping. Or hath proud Persephone
 Sent me a shadow with thy form and face,
 Only to mock me, that I yet might see
 Some bitterness beyond my former misery?"

'I ceased, and she made answer: "O my child,
 'Tis not Persephone deludes thee here:
 This is their portion who from light exiled
 Dying descend into these regions drear,
 Sinewless, fleshless, boneless. On the bier
 All substance was burnt out by force of fire,
 When first the spirit, her cold flight to steer,
 Left the white bones, and fluttering from the pyre
 Straight to these shadowy realms did like a dream retire."'
 (xi. 29-32.)

There can be no doubt that a slow and majestic movement is especially congenial to the stanza of Spenser, in spite of its great flexibility. If the metre becomes cumbrous and awkward when applied to the combats and onslaughts of the *Iliad*, it imparts a singular charm to episodes like those of Nausicaa, Circe or Calypso. There is much beauty in the prayer by which the latter seeks to retain Odysseus in his island home—

"Child of Laertes, wouldst thou fain depart
 Hence to thine own dear fatherland? Farewell!
 Yet, couldst thou read the sorrow and the smart,
 With me in immortality to dwell
 Thou wouldst rejoice, and love my mansion well.
 Deeply and long thou yearnest for thy wife,
 Yet her in beauty I perchance excel,
 Be-seems not one who hath but mortal life
 With forms of deathless mould to challenge a vain strife."

'To whom the wise Odysseus, answering, spake:
 "O nymph Calypso, much revered, cease now
 From anger, nor be wrath for my wife's sake.
 All this I know, and do myself avow.
 Well may Penelope in form and brow
 And stature seem inferior far to thee,
 For she is mortal and immortal thou.
 Yet even thus 'tis very dear to me,
 My long-desired return and ancient home to see."

"But if some god amid the wine-dark flood
 With doom pursue me and my vessel mar,
 Then will I bear it as a brave man should.
 Not the first time I suffer. Wave and war
 Deep in my life have graven many a scar.
 Let this be numbered with the labours gone."
 He ended, and came up the evening star.'

(vv. 25-30.)

To such a poem no extracts can ever do justice; and they who, not knowing the original, steadily read through the version of Mr. Worsley, are little likely to be disappointed. If, on the whole, we think that he has reproduced rather than translated Homer, we are disposed to praise his wisdom for preferring a practicable to an impossible task. English hexameters are simply a collection of anapæsts, and such they must remain unless we are prepared to talk of—

‘Procession, complex melodies, pause, quantity, accent,
After Virgilian precedent and practice in order.’*

Hexameters of this fashion will never do for our language, nor do they much represent the hexameters of Homer. If those of Heinrich Voss are not faultless, it is vain to look for equal excellence in this metre, which, when clothed in an English garb, must lie open to objections greater than any which can be urged against the hendecasyllables of the Dean of Canterbury. The toil bestowed on such attempts is probably labour lost. Mr. Worsley has at least the more solid satisfaction that he has placed in the hands of English readers a poem which deserves to outlive the present generation.

ART. III.—1. *Report of the Tithe Redemption Trust for the Church in England and Wales for the year 1862.*

2. *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords appointed to inquire into the Deficiency of Means of Spiritual Instruction in the Metropolis, and in other Populous Districts in England and Wales, especially in the Mining and Manufacturing Districts; and to consider the fittest Means of meeting the Difficulties of the Case.* 1858.

FOR some years past a Society has been working in a quiet and unobtrusive manner, to which, if we are to judge by the usual test of popularity, — namely, the subscription list, — the public at large does but scant justice. The Society to which we allude is that which was established in the year 1846 for the Redemption of Tithes. It calls itself ‘The Tithe ‘Redemption Trust for the Church in England and Wales,’ and its object is to purchase tithes which have been alienated from the parish whence they are derived, and to restore them to the clergyman. Its aim is, in fact, to abolish vicarages and per-

* Arnold’s Last Words on translating Homer. (P. 43.)

petual curacies throughout England, and by its magic wand transform the vicars and curates into rectors.* The distinction between these appellations is a very real one. Some of our readers may have imagined an incumbent to be an incumbent, and that it mattered but little whether he were called a vicar or a rector. Never was there a greater mistake. The title, vicar—or rather the fact of which the title proves the existence—opens a dark page in our constitutional history. It reminds us of days gone by when too often might made right; it recalls to our memory scenes discreditable to the annals of our country. Before us rise visions of gross superstition, monarchs hoping to purchase the favour of heaven and wipe out the records of profligacy by endowing in their last hours a religious house—until in the course of years the iniquities of the monasteries reached such a height that they must be by force dissolved, and their patrimony given to the king's favourites or sold for the replenishment of the royal coffers. A dark page indeed! But the lessons have not been thrown away; for these and similar iniquities of ancient despotism reached the nation's heart, stirred it to its very depths, and from the people in successive generations a cry for liberty arose, whose justice none could gainsay, whose force neither the Crown nor Parliament could resist.

In the earliest days of Christianity in England, ecclesiastical dues were not appropriated to any particular church. Each person was at liberty to pay his tithe to whatever priest or church he pleased. If he did not specially appropriate them, they were paid over to the bishop, who distributed them according to his own discretion. This was found, as might naturally be supposed, to lead to abuses. Accordingly it was ordered by King Edgar that tithes arising from a particular parish should be appropriated, in ordinary cases, to the mother church of that parish; and the sound principle was established that the tithes paid by the owners of property in a particular

* A Society somewhat similar was established in the reign of Charles I. Money was freely contributed for the purchase of impropriate tithes; but the Society, instead of restoring the tithes to those parishes from which they were drawn, received 'the rents and profits' into their own hands, and disposed them to ministers and lecturers 'in those or other places at their own discretion.' An outcry was consequently made against the managers of the Society, as acting illegally and unjustly, and in 1632 the Attorney-general brought an information against them in the Exchequer: the Court decided against them, and the Society was dissolved. See 'Fuller's Church Hist.' Century xvii. B. xi. p. 137. 'Kennet's Case of Impropriations,' p. 190-204.

parish should provide for the spiritual welfare of its inhabitants. Unhappily, this principle has been very widely departed from. In process of time the monks cast a longing eye upon the property of the parochial priest, and by every means in their power endeavoured to get possession of it. All the wheels of their spiritual machinery were set in motion. For masses and obits, if not for money, they begged and bought such advowsons as were within their reach, and then with the king's licence appropriated their proceeds to the uses of their monastery. The services of the church, from which the tithes were thus abstracted, could not, for very shame, be wholly set aside. Instead, however, of instituting a clerk to the benefice, they retained it nominally in their own hands, and delegated to one of their body the provision for the services of the church. He acted as *vicarius*, and whilst the lion's share of the tithe was retained in the capacious grasp of the monastery, a certain portion of it (commonly called the small or vicarial tithes) was allotted to him in payment for his services. For many years this vicar was removeable at the caprice of the ruling powers in the monasteries, but in the reign of Henry IV. it was enacted that the vicar should be permanent, canonically instituted and inducted, and endowed at the discretion of the Ordinary.

In the dissolution of monasteries by Henry VIII., the evil of vicarages was not remedied. At that time the great tithes (i.e. the rectorial in opposition to the vicarial tithes) of one-third of all the parishes in England were in the hands of religious houses, and, by a special clause in the statutes 27 Henry VIII. c. 28., and 31 Henry VIII. c. 13., the right over these tithes was expressly reserved to the Crown. What a golden opportunity for their restoration to their original purposes! How tantalising for the vicars of those days to see the opportunity thrown away, to witness the re-appropriation of the tithes to bishopricks, chapters, colleges, or — still worse — to see them given to lay favourites of the Crown!

Far worse, however, than the position of a vicar is that of the anomaly of good Queen Anne's creation, the perpetual curate. The condition and origin of this species of incumbent is seldom understood, and requires explanation. Under certain circumstances religious houses were relieved from the obligation under the Act of Henry IV. of endowing a perpetual vicar, and the cure was served by a curate belonging to the house, either as a chaplain in nunneries, or as a brother of the order in monasteries. On the transfer of the tithes to laymen at the dissolution, if there was no vicar endowed, there was only the

legal obligation of finding a temporary curate to serve the church, which affected the impropriator. So precarious was the position of such curate that the Court of Queen's Bench in 1604 held that he could not be entitled by prescription to any portion of the tithes; for, said the Court, 'he cannot prescribe against his master the impropriator, who may remove him at his pleasure.' Efforts were made at the Restoration to encourage settling tithes in trust for the curate for the time being serving a cure, but he was not capable of taking a grant of property directly, being no corporation and having no perpetuity; and although the Court of Chancery in 1685 laid down that where there was no vicar endowed, the impropriator was bound to maintain a priest, yet the obligation was constantly evaded, and the right to enforce it seldom, if ever, maintained. It was the object of Queen Anne to improve the condition of the ministers serving these cures, by the granting to the Bounty Board the first fruits and tenths of all livings above 50*l.* a year. The Act of George I., which ratified and confirmed her Majesty's intentions, recited what was practically the state of the law,—that in many cases it would be in the power of the impropriator to withdraw the allowance then paid to the curate serving the cure. The Bounty Acts declared that all such curacies, when once augmented by the Bounty Board, should be ever thenceforth 'Perpetual Curacies and Benefices;' and thus originated the perpetual curate. Sanguine advocates of the principle that the tithe-owner was bound to find a priest to serve the cure until such curate was endowed, have regretted that the pittance provided by the Bounty Board should thus have put an end to the obligation of the impropriator.

It is in this way that the evils of impropriated tithes and perpetual curacies began. The Church has in many cases lost her own, and in many places where the munificence of our forefathers provided ample means for the maintenance of the clergyman, he is at present the recipient of an annual sum which the squire's butler would think it derogatory to his dignity to accept. The tenant-farmers pay the tithes grudgingly, for they go out of the parish, perhaps into the pockets of a layman not residing in the neighbourhood, and who is to such an extent careless of his duties as rector, that even the chancel of the church, which it is his bounden duty to repair, may fall unheeded to the ground.

Nor does the evil end here when the parochial property of the Church is diverted to purposes often inconsistent with its true object. For in these days the clergyman of a parish cannot fold his hands, and consider that he has sufficiently

discharged his duty, if the official services of the Church be regularly and decently performed. He is, or ought to be, a centre of work. His should be the head to devise — his should be the hand to carry out, plans both for the temporal and spiritual improvement of the people committed to his charge. And this cannot be done if his income is such as to make it almost a cruel jest to call his incumbency a living. In many cases the charities of the parish depend, in a great measure, upon himself. The deficiency in the clothing-club, fuel, and school accounts have to be met; and if he does not make himself answerable for them, no one else will do so. The aggregate revenues of the Church of England are large, but so are the charges imposed upon the clergy. The parochial income, chiefly derived from the tithes, is not merely to be considered as a fund for the sustentation of the parish priest, it is also the Christian revenue of the parish, and upon which in the last resort the sick, the ignorant, and the indigent fall back for the relief of their several necessities.

Therefore the welfare of the parish in its highest sense depends, to a considerable degree, on the means possessed by the parochial clergy for meeting these demands; and we can conceive no greater hardship and injustice to a parish than that a large annual sum charged upon the landed income for spiritual purposes should be altogether abstracted from these local objects, which cannot otherwise be provided for, and devoted to other purposes wholly foreign to the parochial interests. The land is charged its due quota to the Church, but the iniquitous alienation of former ages starves the present incumbent, and legalises the abstraction of the Church's revenues from the district which supplies them. It may be that there is an overwhelming population to be cared for. If spiritual provision is to be made for the people, the Church services must be multiplied. If the sick and the dying are to be pastorally visited, additional curates are absolutely necessary. If the nooks and alleys are to be searched, so that the lame and halt may be ministered unto, agencies of various kinds must be brought to bear upon the district. But alas! the funds, which in a rector's hands might have helped forward all these good works, are carried off from the luckless vicar; perhaps to the other side of England, to swell the revenues either of laymen or of ecclesiastical bodies, who receive this property without the slightest acknowledgement of the duties that properly appertain to it. We are well aware, that the ground on which we are treading is mined and countermined, and that we incur considerable danger in trespassing within the fortress. But we have

counted the cost, and think that the possible advantage counterbalances the certain risk, and therefore enter the lists to break a lance with tithe-impropriators.

There is one happy circumstance connected with the whole subject, inasmuch as neither laymen nor churchmen can throw the blame entirely on the other. Bishops, chapters, prebendaries, and colleges, as well as laymen, are tithe-impropriators. No one has plundered the parochial clergy to a greater extent than the high dignitaries and spiritual corporations of the Establishment. He would undoubtedly be a great benefactor to the Church, who could suggest a scheme which, whilst respecting vested interests, would yet restore to their original purpose the impropriated tithes. Ventilation of the subject is the only way by which we may hope to arrive at this happy consummation.

Impropriation of tithes* is certainly no new grievance. Pope Alexander III., in the time of Henry II., sent a reprimand to the English bishops for the injury done to the clergy by their consenting to appropriations. In 1240 the clergy of Berkshire answered the Pope's legate: — 'That by authority of the Holy Fathers, the fruits of parochial benefices were assigned to certain uses of the Church, of the ministers, and of the poor, and ought not to be converted to any other uses.' Grosthead, Bishop of Lincoln, and Peckham, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the thirteenth century, waged deadly war against appropriations. The former took away the Church of Ailesbury from the Deanery of Lincoln, and appointed a rector, although the living was afterwards again made prebendal. He also obtained a bull from Pope Innocent IV., authorising him to cancel all appropriations in his diocese, which had been made without the consent of the bishop and chapter. The latter, Archbishop Peckham, published decrees and constitutions against appropriations, writing to the Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, 'that by the many appropriations he had made in his diocese, the health of souls was perpetually wounded; and that he had incurred no small danger, by breaking the statutes of the Holy Fathers inhibiting such appropriations; and by going contrary to the form of a legatine constitution, which had been lately recited and enforced in his Provincial Council.' In the

* Bishop Pilkington on Haggai, i. 7,*8., Parker Society, gives the following quaint derivation of the word impropriation: 'God grant that the Gospel may restore that justly which the Pope took wrongfully away, and gave them yet a right name of impropriations, because improperly they be taken away, and properly belong to the parishes.'

time of Richard II., the Commons in Parliament assembled remonstrated against the evil, — a remonstrance repeated in the reigns of Henry IV. and Henry VI. Latimer failed not to press the subject urgently upon the young king Edward VI. In fact, the writings of the Reformers of the sixteenth century are full of the most plain-spoken denunciations of it. Take the following passage as an example :—

‘The world dealeth with God’s clergy as Dionysius the tyrant with Jupiter’s idol. They make themselves as merry with spoiling Christ’s patrimony, as he with robbing Jupiter of his golden cloak; which being too heavy for summer, and too cold for winter, he took away, and left instead of it a cotton coat, light for the one time, and warm for the other.’ (*Sermon Preached before Queen Elizabeth, by Archbishop Sandys.* Parker Society, p. 154.)

In like manner in ‘the millenary petition’ presented to James I. A.D. 1604, the clergy prayed,—

‘That bishops leave their commendams: some holding prebends, some parsonages, some vicarages with their bishopricks; that double-beneficed men be not suffered to hold, some two, some three benefices with cure, and some two, three, or four dignities besides; that impropriations annexed to bishopricks and colleges be demised only to the preachers-incumbents, for the old rent; that the impropriations of laymen’s fees may be charged with a sixth or seventh part of the worth, to the maintenance of the preaching minister.’ (*Fuller’s Church History of Britain*, vol. iii. p. 195.)

Both Oxford and Cambridge greatly resented the presentation of this petition, complaining loudly

‘That the petitioners should proportion a seventh part only out of an impropriation in a layman’s fee; whilst those belonging to colleges and cathedrals should be demised to the vicars at the old rent, without fine, without improvement; whereas scholars, being children of the prophets, counted themselves most proper for church revenues.’ (*Fuller*, vol. iii. p. 196.)

Never, in fact, have there been wanting protests against this gigantic evil, and yet it still remains, and is so deeply rooted that it is almost hopeless to expect that it should be speedily eradicated. But the fact that we cannot wholly remedy a grievance, is no reason why attempts should not be made to reduce it. Hence it was that the matter came before the Select Committee of the House of Lords, appointed to inquire into the deficiency of means of spiritual instruction, and places of Divine worship in the metropolis, and in other populous districts in England and Wales, especially in the mining and manufacturing districts, and to consider the fittest means of meeting the difficulties of the case.

The Bishop of Ripon (Dr. Bickersteth) gave the following evidence:—

‘2499. *Duke of Somerset*. “Does any means occur to you, as you have had so much thought and experience on this subject—could you give the Committee any notion of the way in which we might advance this purpose” (the spiritual advancement of the people) “without calling upon the Government for money, which might be attended with great difficulty?”—“With regard to a rural district, where tithes have been alienated from the Church, one method would be to redeem those tithes, and recover the money back to the Church; but in London that remedy would scarcely apply at all, as far as I am aware.”

“2500. In the country it must be done by purchase, I suppose?”—“It would be done by purchase; but a great deal must be done by voluntary effort.”

‘2506. *Duke of Northumberland*. “You have stated that there is great difficulty in getting any funds for the different parishes; would not the restoration of all tithes held *in commendam* by the bishops, and by deans of chapters, at once supply funds where the parishes required them?”—“Yes, to a very great extent; but that remedy would still, I fear, leave many parishes untouched; where it applies it would be a very great benefit.” (*Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords*. 1858.)

Much light is thrown upon the subject in the same report, in the evidence of Edmund Batten, Esq., one of the standing counsel to the Tithe Redemption Trust. In answer to Lord Powis, he thus explains the objects of the Society:—

‘4471. “The objects of the trust are, first, to give to owners of alienated tithes an opportunity of restoring them to the spiritual purposes for which they were originally ordained, and to assist them in so doing. Secondly, to apply any tithes thus restored towards relieving the spiritual destitution of the parish or chapelry whence they arise, by adding to the endowment of such parish church or chapel, or by the endowment of new districts therein. Thirdly, to apply to Parliament to facilitate the means of accomplishing these objects. First, by rendering the mode of re-conveyance of tithes less expensive; secondly, by enabling persons having limited interests in impropriate tithes to re-convey them upon adequate compensation being given; and thirdly, by enabling owners of impropriate tithes to give them by will for the endowment of the church in the place whence they arise.”

‘4472. “Has the practical operation of your Society been, by small grants of money, to promote the restoration to spiritual purposes of a considerable amount of tithe-rent charge?”—“A large amount: I should not say a considerable amount.”

‘4474. *Duke of Northumberland*. “Is the amount of tithes which your Society has been instrumental in restoring, very much larger than the actual money which the Society has contributed?”—“Very much indeed. We have seldom contributed anything approaching to

the purchase-money of the tithes. The persons who have been willing to re-convey the tithes have done so, and we have paid the legal expenses."

'4477. "What hinderances have you found from the existing state of the law to the operations of the Society?"—"The greatest hinderance has arisen from the recent decision of the Master of the Rolls, in the case of Denton against Lord John Manners: that was a case in which a gentleman, of the name of Kinderley, left a large sum of money to the treasurer of the Society; and the Master of the Rolls, Sir John Romilly, when the administration of the trusts of the will of Mr. Kinderley was brought before him, decided, that the Society was incapable, from its constitution, of receiving any gift whatever by will, because the object of the Society was to restore the tithes to the Church, which the Master of the Rolls considered to be putting tithes into Mortmain; that it was, therefore, against the statute of the 9th of Geo. II., which forbids the giving by will of any lands or hereditaments to charitable uses; and that the Society, in receiving money, would receive money which would be applied in inducing other people to restore tithes to the parish church, and that it was applying that money so given by will to charitable uses; and that therefore any bequest to the Society was wholly void."

'4481. "Have you found, from the applications made to the Society, that persons will often join in purchasing tithes to endow particular churches, who would not join in subscribing the same sum of money for an endowment?"—"Yes, we find that there are persons who are willing to add to the endowment of a church the tithe rent-charge, or a portion of the tithe rent-charge, of the parish where that church is situated; and that such persons allege, that it is extremely convenient that the ownership of the tithes should be vested in the resident clergyman of the parish; that it is of more value to him than it is to a person at a distance, and that they find, that the payers of a tithe rent-charge pay it more willingly and more readily to the clergyman than they do to a distant and absentee layman."

The Select Committee recommended in their Report,—

'That the Mortmain Acts be so far relaxed as to admit bequests of impropriate tithe rent-charges, or of money for the purchase of the same, for the endowment of any benefice with the cure of souls, to an amount not exceeding 300*l.* per annum.' (*Report*, p. xxi.)

Since that time, however, the matter has lain somewhat dormant, and the recommendation of the Committee has not been carried into effect. It appears that it would only be necessary to add a few words to a clause in an existing Act to remedy the evil complained of. The 13th & 14th Vict. cap. 94. sect. 23. runs thus:—

'Be it enacted, that the owners or proprietors of any impropriation tithes, portion of tithes, or rent-charge in lieu of tithes, shall and may have power to annex the same, or any part thereof, unto the

parsonage, vicarage, or curacy of the parish church or chapel where the same lie or arise; or to settle the same in trust for the benefit of such parsonage, vicarage, or curacy, any statute or law to the contrary thereof in anywise notwithstanding.'

If the words were introduced into this clause, 'shall have 'power to devise the same by will,' all difficulty would be avoided. It might also, perhaps, be advisable to include in the operations of the clause, district churches established within the limits of the place where the tithes arise.

But if any action is to be taken in the matter generally, and any attempt made to carry out remedial measures, it is absolutely necessary that public opinion should be brought to bear upon it. No more effectual means can be adopted to abolish a grievance than to expose it to the light of day.

Some of our readers may, perhaps, hardly be aware of the extent to which tithes have been alienated from their original purpose. It appears, however, by a Parliamentary return in 1848, that there were

'Rent-charges payable to clerical appropriators and lessees, to the amount of	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
'Ditto, to schools and colleges	650,216	8	4 $\frac{3}{4}$			
'Ditto, to lay impropriators	187,519	5	7 $\frac{1}{4}$			
	7,153	9	8			
				1,569,271	3	8
'Ditto, payable to parochial incumbents				2,341,646	1	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
TOTAL				£3,910,917	5	4 $\frac{1}{2}$

It will thus be seen that nearly 40 per cent. of the rent-charge collected throughout the country never reaches the incumbent. The actual averages throughout all the counties of England and Wales are as follows:—

'Payable to clerical appropriators	£12,504
'Payable to schools, colleges, &c. . . .	3,606
'Payable to lay impropriators	14,067
'Payable to parochial incumbents	45,031

There is, however, very considerable disproportion observable in the several amounts respectively payable in the different counties. Essex is very unfortunate. Of the rent-charge collected in that county, no less a sum than 51,243*l.* 3*s.* 11*d.* goes into the pockets of lay-impropriators, while 14,246*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.* is payable to clerical appropriators, 18,996*l.* 4*s.* 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ *d.* to schools, colleges, &c., leaving 153,892*l.* 4*s.* 10*d.* payable to parochial incumbents. Kent, however, is in a still worse condition. Lay impropriators absorb 34,360*l.* 16*s.* 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.*, clerical appropriators take to themselves 70,280*l.* 8*s.* 8*d.*, schools and colleges

7,727*l.* 10*s.* 4½*d.*, making a total of 112,368*l.* 15*s.* 6*d.*, as against 142,537*l.* 9*s.* 2*d.* payable to parochial incumbents. Rutlandshire, as might be expected, is able to show the cleanest hands, 1,138*l.* 16*s.* 11*d.* being payable to lay and clerical impropriators, and 6,819*l.* 8*s.* 9*d.* to parochial incumbents. These statistics show that the lay and clerical element are alike implicated in the impropriation of tithes.

But if we look at a few details of impropriation, the flagrant iniquity of the system will stand out still more clearly. Take for example, the case of the Dean and Chapter of Windsor. The income derived by that body and its lessees from great tithes, amounts, if we are not mistaken, to no less a sum than 27,742*l.* 4*s.* 2*d.* It must be confessed that the chapter is very impartial in its levies. North, south, east and west, alike contribute to swell the capitular revenues. The high downs of Wiltshire, the nestling valleys of Devonshire, the rugged districts of Cornwall, the poor lands of Dorsetshire, the rich soil of Kent, vie with each other in the amount of their contributions. Sixty-one parishes in seventeen counties, pay great tithes to Windsor. Even Wales is not allowed to go free. Devonshire is very heavily taxed. Upwards of 8,000*l.* annually flows from fourteen different parishes, of that county to aid in filling the capitular coffers.

But Trinity College, Cambridge, although the aggregate sum received is not quite so large, yet, like a zoophyte, sends out its feelers on all sides. The total of great tithes received by Trinity College or its lessees is 26,648*l.* 1*s.* 9*d.* To make up this sum contributions are raised from one hundred and ten parishes in fourteen different counties. Unlike the true disciple of Walton who disdains to capture fish under a certain size, Trinity refuses no addition to its basket. While King's-Hatfield in Essex pays 1775*l.* 10*s.*, Newbrough in Yorkshire is not disdained though tendering the modest sum of 1*l.* 3*s.* 8*d.**

Why should the Devonshire vicarages be starved for the sake of Windsor? Why should sixty-four livings in Yorkshire be mulcted of tithes originally given for their support for the fellows of Trinity College? It needs no words to prove the wrong done to the parishes in question. We do not say that either the chapter of Windsor or that Trinity College are undeserving of support, but simply that their endowments ought not to consist of rectorial tithes. We are aware also that the proceeds of six of the Windsor canonries are paid to the Ec-

* We have extracted these particulars from a return on tithes ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, May 4th, 1848.

clesiastical Commissioners, and that 'by the passing of the Act ' 24 & 25 Vict. c. 116, the share of the divisible revenues heretofore received by the Commissioners in respect of the seventh and eighth canonries suspended in Her Majesty's Free Chapel of St. George in Windsor, has been withdrawn from their common fund, and specifically appropriated for the benefit of the Military Knights on the upper or royal foundation of the Castle at Windsor, and to the augmentation of the endowment of the vicarage of the Royal Borough of Windsor, and the perpetual curacy of the district church of the Holy Trinity in Windsor.' (*Ecc. Comm. Rep.* 1862, p. 4.) It is the system, not the individual chapter or college, that we condemn.

We have not referred to the leasing of tithes to individuals on lives by bishops or chapters, because as the Church property falls into the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commission (which refuses to renew on lives) this would be gradually remedied by any measure which affected the dealing of the Ecclesiastical Commission with tithes.

With regard to bishops, chapters, and prebends, we are aware that there are those who urge that their endowment by tithes is the form of impropriation which admits of the best defence. Tithes were provided for the spiritual good of the country. They allege that, theoretically, cathedral bodies, by their devotion to learning, by the stimulus which they give to the worship of God throughout the diocese, help forward the good object for which tithes are given. With regard, moreover, to bishops, they remind us that tithes, which form a portion of episcopal property, were in most cases forced upon bishops in the reign of Elizabeth. She took possession of any ecclesiastical lands or property which belonged to vacant sees, and transferred what was supposed to be an equivalent from the impropriations vested in the Crown. An Act enabling her to do this was passed in the first year of her reign. Tithes, therefore, in the hands of the episcopate, were for the most part what they received in lieu of real property alienated. But these arguments appear to us to have lost their weight since the real property of the Episcopal Sees is vested in the Ecclesiastical Commission, and the revenues of the Bishops are settled at a fixed rate. It is obvious that the surplus, (if any), whether it consist of impropriated tithes or rents, only goes to swell the general fund of the Commissioners, so that one parish is impoverished by the abstraction of its great tithes, only that the amount may swell the amount applicable to the relief of other poor parishes. By the last published report of this body, it appears that independently of the amount accruing to

the Commissioners from their shares of the corporate revenues of certain chapters (which would include income from tithe-rent-charge), their income from tithe and corn rent-charges amounted to 67,032*l.* 16*s.* 5*d.* By Act of Parliament the Commissioners are bound to consider the local circumstances of the parish from which the tithes in their possession are drawn, and to provide to a certain extent for the spiritual wants of the place. Might it not with advantage be made their duty to restore tithes in all cases where the incumbency is poorly endowed, and where such a measure could be carried out? They would thus set an example which it might be hoped others would be induced to follow. Of course this would *pro tanto* diminish their income, and it would be impossible, with due respect to the present claims upon the Commissioners, to carry out such a measure to the fullest extent at once; but ere long a considerable addition will accrue to the annual income available for the Common Fund, and it must be remembered that the restitution of tithes, while diminishing the receipts of the Commissioners, would to the same extent carry out one of the main objects for which the Commission was originally established, namely, the augmentation of poor benefices.

We would moreover suggest the two following modes of adding to the income of the Ecclesiastical Commission, as a partial substitute for that portion of it which would be thus abstracted.

In the year 1860, after very considerable discussion in Parliament, it was enacted, that from that time forth, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners should be bound to consider the local claim of land as much as, and to the same extent as, the local claim of tithe. It has always seemed to us, that the decision of Parliament on this question was unwise. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, when in the possession of a property in any particular locality (unless that property be specially charged with a spiritual trust), are merely landlords. They sink their ecclesiastical character altogether, and appear before the world at large simply as landed proprietors not residing on their own estates, but as having an investment in land. Why are they to act, as regards their property, in a manner different from other landlords? One part of a parish is not, in ordinary cases, more bound, either by law or equity, to provide for the spiritual necessities of the inhabitants than another part. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners have become possessed of the property simply as trustees, for the good of the Church at large, not for the special and particular good of that parish in which the property happens to be situated. People say, with indignation,

‘The Ecclesiastical Commissioners draw such and such sums from our parish, and only subscribe so much to the school, and so much to the other charities; it is monstrous.’ Not at all. It has been the will of Parliament, that to a certain extent, the revenues of the Church should be re-adjusted. That particular property (on which we suppose no previous claim to have existed) has come into the hands of the Commissioners in order that they may have the means of providing for the spiritual exigencies of populous places throughout all England, and to whatever extent the particular parish in which the property lies gains, over and above what may legitimately be required from a good landlord, to that extent some other locality, perhaps much more urgently in need of assistance, is deprived of its due portion of ecclesiastical funds. The Act to which we refer has hardly been in operation long enough yet fully to test its results, but there is no doubt that these local claims of land will very considerably reduce the resources at the disposal of the Commissioners. Our first proposition, therefore, would be to introduce a Bill into Parliament to rescind that portion of the Act of 1860 which obliges the Commissioners to act with land as with tithe. We can hardly doubt, but that calm and careful discussion would show the invalidity of ‘the local claim’ of land.

Our second proposition has respect to those tithes which have been in the hands of deans and chapters, but which now are, or will hereafter merge in, the general fund at the disposal of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

In the report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords, appointed to inquire into the fact of spiritual destitution and the best means of meeting it, we read—

‘This (the relaxation of the Mortmain Acts) might usefully be combined with some well-considered provision, enabling parties to acquire rights of patronage in benefices below a prescribed value, having a population of a prescribed amount in the gift of public offices, or of bodies corporate or sole. To some extent this is already effected by the 19th & 20th Vict. c. 104, but the extension of this principle is worthy of consideration.’ (*Rep.* p. 21.)

We would suggest then, in accordance with the above recommendation, that a Bill should be introduced into Parliament, authorising and compelling the sale of the advowsons of such vicarages as are in the gift of cathedral chapters, and of which they, or the Ecclesiastical Commissioners instead of them, hold the great tithes. The sum received for the advowson would exceed the capital represented by the great tithes, by the sum represented by the vicarial tithes. Supposing, therefore, that the great tithes were restored to the vicar, there would remain

a fair balance to be placed to the credit of the Commissioners as compensation for the abstraction of the rectorial income. To this it will be said, 'You are depriving the cathedral bodies of 'the preferments in their gift.' True; but regulations which the Crown has made, the Crown has the right to modify or re-adjust, if policy and justice alike demand it. Nor are we aware that the appointments by chapters to livings in their gift, are in the main superior to appointments made by lay owners of advowsons. Such a measure should only take effect in the case of each chapter when the existing generation of deans and canons has passed away. Let each new dean, and each new canon, be appointed with the understanding that, in course of time, the body of which he becomes a member will be deprived of a portion of its patronage. Surely Parliament has a perfect right to do this; and we can well imagine that the cathedral bodies would not be loth to part with that which, in innumerable cases, brings with it considerable difficulties. The plan proposed has been already adopted with regard to municipal corporations, in an Act passed in the reign of William IV. (5 & 6 Will. IV. c. 76.) The principle applied to municipal corporations (which was not alienation, but re-adjustment of property), we would humbly suggest, might, with advantage, be applied to capitular bodies.

We would further recommend, that the same course be adopted with regard to livings below a certain value, in the gift of the Lord Chancellor. The Crown has originated the evil of impropriations. Might it not, with much grace, come forward and commence the work of restitution? Let the sum produced by the sale of the advowsons be appropriated to the redemption of tithes, and, *quoad hæc*, the effect would be produced.

With regard to the impropriations of tithes by colleges and laymen, we are aware, that in many cases property has been invested in tithe rent-charge, in the same manner as in any other security. In such a case, of course the purchaser has paid his money, and the wrong done to the Church is thrown back upon the original impropriator. These cases would prevent anything like a general law being laid down; or even a general rule of conduct pointed out, by which tithe-impropriators might be expected to shape their course. The fact is, that each case must be judged by itself, and on its own merits; and we imagine that the only method open to the Church, in endeavouring to obtain the restoration of tithes by laymen is, by obtaining every facility from the legislature for their restoration (such as enabling the voluntary clauses of the Land Claims Consolidation Act to be used by tenants for life of impropriated tithes), and by ap-

pealing soberly and earnestly to the consciences of the impropiators.

Of the former we have already spoken. It remains for us to say a word as to the latter. Surely it is not altogether a hopeless task. We will not believe, that members of colleges or the laity of our own day are less accessible to reason, or less devoutly disposed, than were the collegians and laymen of the seventeenth century. And what do we read of them? Sir Henry Spelman was a man who felt very strongly on the subject of the holding of Church property by laymen, and in the prefatory epistle to his '*History of Tithes*,' published at the Oxford University press, we read—

'If any demand what success the labours of this worthy knight found among the gentlemen of Norfolk and other places, where he lived long in very great esteem, and publicly employed always by his prince and country in all the principal offices of dignity and credit, it is observable to allege some particular testimonies worthy to be recorded to posterity, and with all honour to their names, who were persuaded presently upon the reading of this treatise, to restore and render back unto God what was due unto Him.

'And first the worthy knight practised according to his own rule: for having an impropriation in his estate, viz. Middleton in Norfolk, he took a course to dispose of it for the augmentation of the vicarage, and also some addition to Congham. . . .

'Next, Sir Ralph Hare, knight, his ancient and worthy friend in that county, upon reading of this book, offered to restore a good parsonage, which only he had in his estate, performing it presently, and procuring licence from the king: and also gave the perpetual advowson to S. John's College in Cambridge, that, his heirs afterwards might not revoke his grant. . . .

'Sir Roger Townsend, a religious and very learned knight, of great estate in that county, restored three impropriations to the Church. . . .

'The like I have understood of others in that county, but cannot certainly relate their names and all particulars at this present, that shire abounding with eminent gentlemen of singular deserts, piety, and learning, besides other ornaments, as Camden observeth of them.

'In other parts divers have been moved with his reasons to make like restitution, whereof I will mention some: as Sir William Doddington, knight, of Hampshire, a very religious gentleman, restored no less than six impropriations out of his own estate, to the full value of 600*l.* yearly and more.

'Richard Knightly, of Northamptonshire, lately deceased, restored two impropriations . . . being a gentleman much addicted to works of piety.

'The Right Honourable Baptist Lord Hicks, Viscount Cambden . . . restored and purchased many impropriations:

' 1. He restored one in Pembrokeshire which cost 460*l*.

' 2. One in Northumberland which cost 760*l*.

' 3. One in Durham which cost 366*l*.

' 4. Another in Dorsetshire which cost 760*l*. . . .

' Mrs. Ellen Gulston being possessed of the impropriate parsonage of Bardwell in Suffolk, did first procure from the king leave to annex the same to the vicarage, and to make it presentative: and having formerly the donation of the vicarage, she gave them both thus annexed freely to S. John's College in Oxon. . . .

' The Right Honourable Lord Scudamore, Viscount Sligo, hath very piously restored much to some vicarages in Herefordshire, whereof yet I cannot relate particulars fully.

' Divers colleges in Oxon having been anciently possessed of impropriations, have of late years taken a course to reserve a good portion of their tithe-corn from their tenants, thereby to increase the vicar's maintenance. . . .

' In particular Christ Church in Oxon hath been very careful in this kind. Likewise New College, Magdalene College, and Queen's College have done the like upon their impropriations, and some others have made augmentations also.

' Certain bishops have also done the like; as Dr. Morton, while he was bishop of Lichfield, did abate a good part of his fine to increase the portion of the minister in the vicarage of Pitchley in Northamptonshire, belonging to his bishoprick, and so did his successor Dr. Wright for the vicarage of Towcester, also in the same shire: which was very piously done, considering what great lands and manors were taken away from that bishoprick among others, and some impropriations given in lieu of them.

' And while Sir Henry Spelman lived at London, there came some unto him almost every term to consult with him how they might legally restore and dispose of their impropriations to the benefit of the Church: to whom he gave advice as he was best able, according to their particular cases and inquiries; and there wanted not others that thanked him for his book, promising that they would never purchase any such appropriate parsonages to augment their estates.'

' So that Clement Spelman might well say, "although he was not "so happy as with S. Peter at once to convert thousands, yet was he "not with him so unsuccessful as to fish all night and catch nothing; "for some were persuaded with what was written; neither can I say "that others believed not, but rather think that, like the young man "in the Gospel, they went heavy away, because they had too great "possessions to restore." (Quoted in *Spelman's History and Fate of Sacrilege*, pp. xii-xvi.)

Are there none either amongst the laity, or amongst the collegiate establishments, who will come forward and prove themselves, by a like restitution of tithes, benefactors, both to the age in which they live, and to successive generations?

Something indeed has already been effected. By means of 'The Tithe Redemption Trust,' tithes to the annual amount of

1,035*l.* 4*s.* 2*d.* have been restored to the Church. Through Queen Anne's Bounty Board, tithes of the estimated value of 539*l.* 18*s.* 8*d.* have been restored since 1850.

The Ecclesiastical Commissioners have, since 1840, augmented *vicarages* as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
By stipends paid annually which might be redeemed by the restoration of tithes in those cases in which they are in the Commissioners' hands .	5,583	6	8
By capital sums paid down and invested which might be dealt with in like manner	19,021	0	0
	A. R. P.		
By land	545	1	2
By tithe-rent charge	3,269	4	6
By land estimated at a yearly rent of	10	0	0
By benefactions raised to meet the Commissioners' grants	31,478	4	6

Finally, in the last report of 'The Tithe Redemption Trust' we find that cases have been brought to the knowledge of the board, in which tithes have been voluntarily restored to the Church since the establishment of the trust, to the amount of 3,053*l.* 12*s.* 11*d.* per annum.

Now it is true, that even the general total of tithes thus restored, is very small in comparison with the aggregate amount impropriated; but the case is one which seems to us preeminently suited for deliberate and cautious action. We do not see how it is possible, with a due regard to the rights of property legally acquired, to legislate sweepingly upon the subject. The redemption of tithes, which it is agreed on all sides would be very desirable, can only be brought about gradually by individual efforts, and by individual acts of self-denial. But we venture, therefore, earnestly to urge upon the members of the legislature, the necessity of assisting, by every means in their power, the legal restoration of tithes, whether by will or personal gift. Let no impediment, at any rate, be placed in the way of those who are anxious to act thus, lest perchance their zeal be cooled, and their course effectually checked.

One word to tithe-impropriators. Upon their liberality, after all, the question of tithe-restoration hinges. We can well fancy, that at times they may be led to ask themselves the question whether tithes are, or are not, a desirable property to possess? Conscience may sometimes whisper, that they are enjoying that which, had it not been for the wrong doing of those who lived in 'auld lang syne,' would now be ministering to the comfort

of some hard-working parish priest, and to the wants of the parish from which they are perhaps drawing the great tithes once appropriated to the service of God and the instruction of the people. We do not dictate, still less do we condemn; but if any tithe-impropriators can with justice, whether to the establishment to which they belong or to their families, see their way to the restoration of impropriated tithes, we believe that they would be acting honourably towards the Church, usefully to the nation; and that the deed would bring with it the reward of a satisfied conscience.

ART. IV.—*Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers, relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain, preserved in the Archives of Simancas and elsewhere. Vol. I. Henry VII. 1485—1509. Edited by G. A. BERGENROTH. Published by the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. London: 1862.*

SIR JOHN ROMILLY has done good service to literature by the steps which he has taken to procure for the National Record Office copies of the valuable State Papers relating to English history, which are preserved amongst the Spanish archives; and he has been very fortunate in securing for this purpose the assistance of Mr. Bergenroth, who has devoted two years of incessant labour to the preparation and production of the elaborate and interesting volume now before us. We have not found in any of the publications previously issued at the national expense, and under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, as much original matter, or as much of real historical interest, as this work, under the unattractive name of a 'Calendar,' certainly affords. The documents described in it relate for the most part to the negotiations between England and Spain in the reign of Henry VII., between the years 1485 and 1509; but Mr. Bergenroth has judiciously included various papers bearing on contemporary history and on subjects of general interest.

The most numerous and important of these papers are preserved in the famous archives at Simancas, a small village eight miles distant from Valladolid. The old crenellated castle, now filled with the State Papers of Spain, was confiscated to the Crown by Queen Isabella. It consists of forty-eight rooms crammed with records, and one large chamber in which the officers and literary readers are accommodated. This room has a northern aspect, and as no fires are allowed in the building, so

bitter is the cold in winter that the thermometer frequently sinks to freezing point and ink becomes congealed. Although Mr. Bergenroth's labour was evidently one of love, it was prosecuted under circumstances of great physical discomfort in this stern abode, where he recorded the secrets, the stratagems, and the crimes of the Court of Spain for nearly three centuries. He describes the country in which he had to reside as barren and treeless. For nine months out of the twelve it is destitute of verdure, and the climate, in consequence of the great elevation of the land, is very severe. The student who wishes to consult the archives is obliged to live in the house of some poor peasant; indeed, we believe, that Mr. Bergenroth is now building a house there to enable himself to continue his researches. The food is worse than the lodgings; no social intercourse, no books, not even the commonest works of reference, are to be had. To these miseries must be added not only the labour of examining manuscripts in ancient handwriting and in various languages, but also the task of deciphering many of them written in various ciphers, the keys of which were either not forthcoming or unknown. This task involved great and almost incredible labour, especially to a man who had not previously directed his attention to this art. Mr. Bergenroth gives the following account of his operations:—

‘In the month of August 1860 I found myself duly installed in the Reading Room of the Archives at Simancas. I did not go to Spain quite unprepared for my work. I had carefully studied the Paleographie of Christoval Rodriguez; I had also spent much time in deciphering such old Spanish documents as were to be found in the libraries of London and Paris. But when the first legajo was placed before me I almost despaired. I can imagine a man, who has navigated a little river, all at once finding himself in mid ocean, bewildered by the waves running mountains high. The specimens given by Rodriguez contain all the principal features characteristic of the Spanish writing of that period. But they are neat and clean engravings, whilst the papers with which I had to do were the rough drafts of Ferdinand Alvarez, Secretary of State to Ferdinand and Isabella. They are incoherent and confused, portions are blotted out, and marginal additions are written in such small characters as scarcely to be discernible. In fact, the writing is more difficult than any which I subsequently met with. I passed whole days at first over a few lines. I can never be grateful enough to the Archivero, Don Manuel Garcia Gonzalez, who, with ever ready courtesy, assisted me in making out the characters with which he had become intimately acquainted during a time extending beyond the general average of human life.

‘As soon as the conduct of the business passed from the hands of the aged and mentally exhausted Alvarez into those of Miguel Perez

Almazan, a very great improvement in style and writing is observable. Almazan was, if not the inventor, at any rate the person who introduced cipher into Spain. The whole history of ciphered writing, from its rudest beginnings until it had become so complicated a system that even those statesmen who were the most thoroughly initiated into the art were unable to make use of it, may be studied in the papers belonging to a period of about fifteen years. On some of the deciphered despatches marginal notes such as the following may be found. "Nonsense," "Impossible," "Cannot be understood," or, "Order the ambassador to send another despatch." After the year 1504, in which year Queen Isabella died, it was found necessary to return to a more simple system of cipher. Some hundreds of ciphered despatches, in the greater part of which not a word of common writing occurred, were before me. In what language were they written? On what subjects did they treat? Were they only copies put in cipher, or drafts which I had already read in common writing? I was unable to answer these questions. I inquired for the keys to the ciphers, but received for answer that there was not any key extant to ciphers of so early a date.

I had never in my life occupied myself with endeavouring to decipher any despatch. Nothing but sheer necessity would have forced me to attempt such a task, which, I think, is one of the most laborious that any man could undertake. Encouraged by my friends in England, I did not, however, despair; and the final result of my labours was that I discovered the keys to all the ciphers excepting one. It is employed in a short letter of Ferdinand and Isabella to Ferdinand Duke de Estrada, their ambassador in England, dated Segovia, 20th Aug. 1503. It is the only paper extant in that cipher, and it is easy to understand that the shorter the letter is the more difficult is the discovery of the key. I have formed twenty keys; but I will not insist upon that number, as some keys so nearly resemble one another that it is difficult to determine whether they are the same keys, with some alterations, or new ones. In most cases, however, they differ so far that one key does not afford the least help towards finding out another. Some of the keys were of use to me in deciphering page after page; others were useful only for reading a few lines or sentences.

When I had nearly completed all my keys, doubts arose in the Archives whether I could be permitted to copy the ciphered documents. As I was the only man living who was able to interpret them, the control to be exercised by the Archivero was impossible. The ciphered despatches were actually taken from me, and all my labour seemed destined to be fruitless. I went to Madrid. The result of my appeals to the ministry showed that the whole affair had simply been due to a misunderstanding. The Spanish Government, treating me with the greatest liberality, imposed only one condition; namely, that I should leave copies of all my decipherings and keys in the archives, to which I gladly consented. When I returned to Simancas the ciphered documents were not only restored to me, but another search for keys to the ciphers was made, and resulted in the

discovery of one complete key and the fragments of two others. The complete key was the one which had been the most used in the extensive correspondence of Doctor De Puebla with the Spanish Government. It contains two thousand four hundred signs. Had it been found some months earlier, when I first asked for it, it would have saved me immense labour, injurious to my health. As it was, it only served to confirm me in the conviction I had entertained that my discoveries were real, and to fill up some blanks occasioned by the circumstance that certain signs had never been made use of in the correspondence.' (*Introd.*, pp. xi—xiii.)

The oldest record preserved at Simancas is a kind of Land-book of Peter the Cruel—the Domesday Book of Castile: but it is not till the second decade of the 16th century that the collections become rich, full, and continuous. The English correspondence, however, begins twenty years earlier. Certain *arcas*, or chests, containing state papers were concealed during the wars of the Commenceros in a convent at Zaragoza: they escaped pillage, and when opened were found to contain the English papers. The practice of the Court of Spain under Ferdinand and Isabella was to keep their state papers in these chests, scattered about all parts of their wide dominions. Sometimes a despatch would not be answered, because access could not be had to the place where it was deposited. Sometimes the papers were lost altogether. At length Charles V., in 1543, selected Simancas as the general receptacle of the scattered muniments of the kingdom. Philip II. enormously increased the collection, not only by his own prodigious correspondence, but by sending agents to collect records in all parts of his dominions. The archives at present contain considerably more than 100,000 *legajos* or bundles of papers, and as each *legajo* consists of about one hundred papers, the whole number of documents exceeds *ten millions*. About one-tenth of the collection relates to foreign affairs, and of these 587 *legajos* to the affairs of England. All access to this extraordinary repository was most jealously prohibited by the Crown of Spain down to a very recent period, and it was not until 1844 that the regulations were relaxed, in favour of commissioners from France and Belgium, who were allowed to copy papers for their respective Governments. Access to the papers is, however, now granted by the Spanish authorities on liberal terms for the purposes of literary and historical research.*

The period to which the documents relate which are here catalogued and described, was one of great interest, for it im-

* Lingard states that he had the benefit of extracts of the Simancas records made for him by a friend in Spain (iv. p. 335.).

mediately preceded and introduced the eventful age of Henry VIII., the Emperor Charles V., and the Reformation. Europe was already occupied in fixing the territorial limits of the great monarchies. France was gradually bringing her dismembered provinces under the authority of the Crown; Castile and Arragon united, under Ferdinand and Isabella, were engaged in endeavours to limit French territorial extension; and the groundwork was laid for the eventual connexion between the German and Spanish Empires enriched by the succession of the heiress of Burgundy. If ever the history of England is written with especial reference to the foreign relations of the Crown; if ever we possess an English work resembling in plan M. Flassan's excellent 'History of the Diplomacy of France,' the reign of Henry VII. ought to be regarded as the starting point of England's policy as a European Power. The union of the Houses of York and Lancaster was effected by the Tudor dynasty. The Wars of the Roses had mown down the feudal nobles. The power of the Crown became paramount, and was nowhere more conspicuous than in its transactions with foreign Courts. The House of Burgundy, the House of Austria, the Houses of Spain, the House of France, were already engaged in forming those combinations of alliances and inter-marriages, which continued for centuries to affect the distribution of power. England was not yet dis severed from Catholic Europe by that mighty rent, which gave in the following century so decided a stamp to her policy and to her national institutions; and the throne of England was occupied by a sovereign of a sagacious and calculating disposition, whose three great objects in life were to secure his dynasty, to enrich himself, and to ally himself with the most powerful races in Europe. The King studiously maintained a neutral position, sometimes by treating with all the foreign Powers which competed for his alliance, sometimes by refusing to treat with any of them; and the records of Simancas are filled with evidence of the varying influences which, sometimes in the shape of threats to his scarcely achieved sovereignty at home, at other times of appeals to his covetousness abroad, were brought by each in succession to bear upon Henry VII. A lively picture is presented in these papers of the complicated intrigues and negotiations which had these objects in view, in an age when Royal marriages formed the great business of Courts. Those loveless ties, so imperfectly joined, and so soon torn asunder by political differences, were regarded as the most sacred and enduring pledge of alliances; and it would seem as if the fate of the nations of Europe was to be determined by the marriages

of their rulers. Thus, in speaking of Ferdinand, Mr. Bergenroth observes:—

‘Ferdinand had great confidence in his family relationships, and thought the world was to be governed by means of marriages and family connexions. That was not an opinion peculiar to him. The whole age might be called a dynastic age, and marriages have never assumed so much importance since, as they did then. The reason was that treaties did not offer any security, but were broken as soon as they were negotiated and sworn. There seemed really to be no lasting bond between man and man except the sacrament of marriage. In one respect, however, Ferdinand differed widely from the kings of his time. In his opinion the family connexions of the reigning houses ought to be subordinated to higher principles of policy. He was most probably the first statesman of the middle ages who saw that a strong government must not be based upon heterogeneous national elements and disjointed provinces. Had not events, beyond the control of man, prevented him from carrying out his plans, the map of Europe would have been constituted three hundred and fifty years ago almost as it now stands.’

Of contemporary sovereigns, Ferdinand and Isabella were undoubtedly the most distinguished; and our readers are familiar with the historical portraits of these great sovereigns which Mr. Prescott has traced with a loving hand. It must be confessed that the archives of Simancas tell in many respects a different and a less favourable tale. These unpromising records give up secrets which the admirers of Isabella would fain disbelieve, and they certainly establish beyond all doubt the active part taken by the queen in the establishment of that most hateful instrument of ecclesiastical tyranny—the Inquisition. The following important passage from M. Bergenroth’s Introduction throws an entirely new light on these dreadful transactions:—

‘In the year 1478 Ferdinand and Isabella were staying at Seville. At the same place a small assembly of priests and laymen were gathered together to consider how the evil influence exercised by the Jews over Christians could be prevented. The King and Queen took part in the deliberations, the result of which was, that all priests in towns and villages were instructed to use their earnest endeavours to bring back the erring sheep into the true fold. It was easy to predict that this measure would produce no effect. The next step taken by Ferdinand and Isabella was to request of the Pope a bull, by which the reverend father, Friar Tomas de Torquemada, or as he is styled in Latin documents, *Turrcremata*, should be confirmed as Inquisitor-General in Spain, with power to nominate his agents. This bull was granted in the year 1481. Torquemada was the confessor, not, as it is sometimes believed, of the Queen, but of King Ferdinand, and he was Prior of the convent of Santa Cruz in Segovia.

The first act performed by Torquemada, on his elevation to his new dignity, was what he called an act of grace. He published an edict, which was placarded on all the church doors throughout Spain, by which sinners were commanded to confess and repent within a certain number of days. Fifteen thousand persons obeyed his behest. Penances, differing in degree, according to the guilt of the offenders, were imposed. As soon as the period of grace had terminated, the Inquisition began its reign of terror. It must not be imagined that it had to take cognisance of religious dogmas alone; morality in general, and matrimonial causes, were also subject to its jurisdiction. The punishments inflicted by the inquisitors were, death by fire, imprisonment for life, or for a certain term of years. Those who were restored to liberty were obliged constantly to wear red crosses outside their clothes, one on their back and one on their breast, for the remainder of their days. The use of gold, silk, and camlet was, moreover, forbidden them. They and their children were declared incapable of holding any office or trust. The whole of Spain from one end to the other was startled by the flames of the *autos da fé*. Towns, provinces, and kingdoms sent deputations to Ferdinand and Isabella declaring that it was impossible to submit to such cruelty. In some of the provinces there still remained officers of the former Inquisition. They had become harmless, and their very existence almost forgotten. On this occasion they again showed signs of life by protesting in stronger terms than the rest of the Spanish people against the new institution. The storm was so general that it seemed almost impossible to withstand it, but Ferdinand and Isabella bore the brunt of it immoveably. They sent commissioners with secret instructions to their governors of provinces and kingdoms, who had also begun to waver, threatening them, on the one hand, with the most terrible punishments, and on the other, luring them to their cause by promises of riches and greatness.

Notwithstanding all the measures taken by Government the inquisitors did not enter into peaceful possession of their offices. They were no sooner installed into them by the help of an armed force than they were driven out again and hunted down by the populace. The utmost that could be obtained was, the prevention of the complete downfall of the Inquisition. This critical state of things was rendered all the more dangerous by the opposition against the Inquisition having extended to Rome itself. The Pope modified the bull which he had given, deposed the most cruel among the inquisitors, and ordered that an appeal to Rome should be opened. Ferdinand responded by sending the Pope a minatory letter.

The Pope was intimidated. On the 3d of August, 1483, he wrote that he intended to reconsider his last resolution in favour of the heretics, and until then he would leave the matter in suspense. As nevertheless papal remissions of penalties were obtained, Ferdinand promulgated an ordinance stating that in the kingdoms of Arragon and Valencia any person, whether ecclesiastical or secular, and without any distinction of class or sex, who should make use of a papal indulgence, should be put to death on the spot.

‘Not only living heretics, but those who had died, were persecuted. They were cited before the tribunals, and if found guilty their bones were exhumed and solemnly burnt. So far the whole procedure looks like a hideous farce; but there was also a serious element in it. The goods that the heretics had left to their heirs were confiscated, and filled the coffers of Queen Isabella and King Ferdinand. Amongst the many dead who were destined to undergo judgment after burial were the father, the mother, and the grandmother of Don Juan Arias de Avila, Bishop of Segovia. As soon as he heard what was in prospect, he drove out from his diocese all the inquisitors, and remonstrated with the King and Queen. When he found that all was in vain, he went in the dead of night to the churchyard of the Convent de la Merced, dug up the bones of his ancestors, and hid them in a place where they could not be found. He himself proceeded to Rome. As soon as Queen Isabella was informed of his journey, she wrote a long letter to her ambassadors at the Papal Court giving them instructions what they were to say to the Pope and the Cardinals. The Bishop of Segovia, she said, had exhumed the bones only in order to deprive the Inquisition of proof that they had been buried after the Jewish fashion. “I have,” she said, “caused great calamities, and “depopulated towns, lands, provinces, and kingdoms,” but she protested that she had acted thus from love of Christ and his Holy Mother. Those were liars and calumniators who said she had done so from love of money, for she had never herself touched a maravedi proceeding from the confiscated goods of the dead. On the contrary, she had employed the money, she asseverated, in educating and giving marriage-portions to the children of the condemned. So solemn a declaration of the Queen seems to demand respect. If, however, we turn over the leaves of the State Papers, we find orders emanating from her which very strongly impeach her veracity. Amongst many instances I will quote one. A certain Pecho of Xerez had been condemned for heresy, and his property, to the amount of 200,000 maravedis, was confiscated. 20,000 maravedis was the portion of the widow, who with her children remained in utter destitution. The Queen granted them, as a special favour, 30,000 maravedis, and the rest went into her own coffers. There is a great number of similar cases to be found; and as the registers speak only of her bounties, the instances in which she took possession of all the confiscated goods remain unnoticed.

‘The Pope determined to send a legate to Spain in order to inquire into the proceedings of the Inquisition. Isabella did all in her power to prevent it. She used corruption on a large scale, larger even, as she declared, than was agreeable to herself. The final result was that the Courts of Spain and Rome came to an understanding respecting the person who was to be sent as legate. He received rich donations in Spain, and his inquiry was reduced to a mere form. It is characteristic of the Queen that the only condition she made was, that his Holiness shall absolve her from simony. We are indebted to the Archivero of Barcelona, who lived at that time, for many lists of *autos da fe*. We find among the sufferers men of all classes,—

clergymen, officers in the army, tailors, and cobblers; but the number of widows of merchants occupies a disproportionately large space in the different lists. Were they really more inclined to heresy, or were they only rich and comparatively defenceless?

'From this time forth the Inquisition was established on solid foundations. Two thousand men and women were burned, and a still greater number condemned to perpetual imprisonment, while immense numbers fled to France, Italy, and other countries. In Xerez, Seville, and Cordova alone, 4,000 homesteads were deserted. The Queen was implored to relent. But she answered that it was better for the service of God and herself to have the country depopulated than to have it polluted by heresy. Persecution even hunted the fugitives in foreign countries. The King of Naples, for instance, was requested, in a tone of command, to torture and put to death all those who would not at once deliver the small remnants of the fortune they had saved.

'The heretics were not safe even in England. Ferdinand and Isabella, in their letter of the 18th August, 1494, asked Henry, as a special favour, to prevent the courts of law from condemning Diego de Soria, a Spanish merchant in London, to pay back to the fugitive Jews such sums of money as they had confided to him on leaving Spain. In the year 1498, when Londoño and the Sub-Prior of Santa Cruz were sent to England, the Sub-Prior had a secret mission to Henry. The instructions relating to it are not extant, but there is no doubt that they were connected with religious persecution. The Sub-Prior gives a short sketch in his letter of the 18th of July of his conversation with the King of England, from which it is perfectly clear that certain demands respecting the Inquisition were made. Ferdinand and Isabella had expressed their sorrow that, whilst Spain had been purged of infidelity, Flanders and England were infected by that scourge. Henry laying both hands on his breast swore that he would persecute without mercy any "cursed" Jew or heretic that the Queen of Spain could point out in his dominions. Much more, however, must have been said on both sides, as the Sub-Prior writes he spoke to the King for a long while on the subject. We know from other sources that soon afterwards new processes against heretics were begun in England. But the proceedings were not very severe, and nothing like the Inquisition was ever attempted by Henry.' (*Intro.*, pp. xlii—xlvi.)

M. Bergenroth's estimate of the moral qualities of 'Los Reyes Catolicos,' as they are still styled by the Spaniards, is not high.

'Neither Ferdinand nor Isabella scrupled to tell direct untruths, and make false promises whenever they thought it expedient to their policy. But if any distinction is to be made, certainly Queen Isabella excelled her husband in disregard to veracity; and it even seems to have been a matter of understanding between the two, that whenever any very flagrant falsehood was to be uttered, she should be the one to do it. She appears to have been very liable to mistake

her own interests for those of God, whose name she constantly had on her lips, or to substitute self-glorification for real love of the people.' (*Introd.*, pp. xxxv—xxxviii.)

A very different picture from that given by Mr. Prescott when, in summing up her great and good qualities, he says that 'Artifice and duplicity were so abhorrent to her character, and 'so averse from her domestic policy, that when they appear in the 'foreign relations of Spain, it is certainly not imputable to 'her.' The extract in the preceding pages equally confutes his assertions with reference to the Inquisition, 'that it was not 'easy to vanquish Isabella's aversion to measures so repugnant 'to the natural benevolence and magnanimity of her character;' and that 'it was not until the Queen had endured the repeated 'importunities of the clergy, particularly of those reverend persons in whom she most confided, seconded by the arguments 'of Ferdinand, that she consented to solicit from the Pope a 'bull for the introduction of the Holy Office into Castile.*

It is time, however, for us to return to the Simancas records. The first papers which attract attention are Henry's Commission (March, 1488), empowering his representatives to contract an alliance with Ferdinand and Isabella; and the two commissions from those sovereigns authorising De Puebla and Sepulveda (two Spanish envoys) to negotiate a marriage between the Infanta Katherine and Prince Arthur, and to treat for the renewal and reformation of the treaties between the two countries. The negotiations thus opened seem to have been the result of some communications which had already passed in Spain between English commissioners and Ferdinand and Isabella. De Puebla was now selected to carry on the affair, and one of the most interesting portions of the volume before us is that which contains his correspondence with his sovereign on this occasion.

Strangely enough Bacon, who is followed by Hume, attributes to another person the conduct of the marriage negotiation. 'Amongst these troubles,' says Bacon, 'both civil and external, 'came into England from Spain Peter Hialas, some call him 'Elias . . . A man of great wisdom, and, as those times were, 'not unlearned, sent from Ferdinand and Isabella . . . unto the 'king to treat a marriage' between the prince and princess. 'This 'treaty was by him set in a very good way, and almost brought 'to perfection.'† The 'Elias' thus spoken of was Don Pedro

* Prescott's 'Ferdinand and Isabella,' chap. vii. vol. i. p. 260.

† We shall have occasion to refer more than once, in the course of
VOL. CXVII. NO. CCXL. D D

de Ayala, Apostolic and Imperial Prothonotary. He first appears in this correspondence in the capacity of Spanish ambassador in Scotland, but this was at a later period. In 1490 de Puebla was acting for Spain in Scotch affairs, and we find him engaged in a notable scheme for palming off in marriage upon James IV. an illegitimate daughter of Ferdinand as being legitimate. For this he was reproved by Ferdinand and Isabella, who desired him to tell the real facts of the case to the Scotch ambassador, as 'it is impossible that some one should not tell them the truth, and even we should do so.' Don Pedro is not mentioned as Spanish ambassador before 1496, when he is described as going to Scotland in company with the Scotch ambassador, who in returning to his own country was provided with *Spanish credentials* for fear of his falling into the hands of the English. In 1498 he is spoken of as having assisted in negotiating a treaty between England and Scotland. Afterwards he resided some time in England to the endless annoyance of De Puebla. Sometimes receiving letters of recall from his sovereigns, at other times appointments as their ambassador, his name figures frequently in this correspondence; and it appears that even after he left England Henry was in the habit of consulting him. Don Pedro de Ayala was not, as it now appears, engaged to any extent on the marriage negotiation, which was carried on by De Puebla; and the erroneous statement of Bacon and of Hume proves how little former historians were aware of the real importance of De Puebla's mission, now first brought to light by the correspondence contained in this volume.

De Puebla was a most singular personage. A doctor of civil and canon law, with the sordid manners of a low attorney — a strange mixture of audacity, state-craft, and meanness. He resided in England as Spanish ambassador from 1488 till after Henry's death, with the exception of the interval between 1489 and 1494. Henry at this time does not appear to have maintained any permanent embassy in Spain, and De Puebla, together with the colleagues who were sent to him from Spain in the capacity of rivals or spies, was the principal channel of

these remarks, to Lord Bacon's 'Life of Henry VII.,' and especially to the recent reproduction of that work due to the elaborate care and masterly criticism of Mr. Spedding, which is contained in the seventh volume of his great edition of the works of Bacon. It has been collated with the original copy of the biography, submitted to James I. by Lord Bacon in 1621, and corrected by Bacon's own pen. This manuscript may be seen in the British Museum — Additional MSS., vol. 7084.

intelligence between the two courts during this long period. For some time De Puebla seems to have given satisfaction to his employers, and to have been approved by Henry, who, in testimony of his good opinion, offered him cathedral preferment in England*, and an English heiress as a wife. Matters were not, however, to continue on this satisfactory footing; and in 1498 Ferdinand and Isabella directed certain agents to report on his proceedings in England, as he was said to be 'entirely in the interest of King Henry.' These agents reported that the allegation was true; that De Puebla was a quarrelsome intriguer and disliked by the Spanish community in England. To sum up in short, De Puebla was 'a liar, a flatterer, calumniator, beggar, and does not seem a good Christian.'

'Some time ago, the king was living at a palace about a quarter of a league from the town in which De Puebla was staying. De Puebla went every day with all his servants to dine at the palace, and continued his unasked-for visits during the space of four or five months. The queen and queen-mother sometimes asked him whether his masters in Castile did not provide him with food? On another occasion, there was a report that De Puebla was coming. The king asked his courtiers, "For what purpose is he coming?" They answered, "to eat."' (P. 161.)

The Spanish merchants in London also accused De Puebla of corruption in lawsuits. They said: 'He begs money from the king, lives meanly, and eats in bad company, with apprentices for 2*d.* a-day; . . . under colour of his embassy, he goes to the courts of law, and pleads the causes of merchants who pay him.'

All this was reported to Ferdinand and Isabella, who, in 1500, instructed Fuensalida, one of their extra ambassadors in England, to watch De Puebla. Fuensalida's proceedings soon gave umbrage to the regular envoy, who wrote to urge that 'it would be better to intrust the business to him alone, and not to send such a person as Fuensalida.' The next year Ferdinand and Isabella sent the Duke de Estrada to England, as their ambassador to Henry and to the Princess of Wales (Katharine); and De Puebla was desired to 'obey him in all he may order.' They told him also, ironically, that the presence of the Duke would remove the obstacles

* This was not an unusual step with Henry, who appointed the Legate Costello successively to the sees of Hereford and Wells; Bacon says, that Costello when Cardinal, 'paid the king large tribute of his gratitude in diligent and judicious advertisement of the occurments of Italy.'

which hindered him 'from creating that new world in the 'affairs of our service respecting which you have written to us 'so many times.' Estrada had also authority, in case of need, to send De Puebla back to Spain. But the Duke himself was recalled in 1504, and De Puebla again left as sole ambassador; and in that capacity he remained, till, by a most singular use of the matrimonial connexion, *the Princess also received credentials*. She, however, soon complained that he was more a vassal of Henry than of his own sovereigns — that his reports could not be trusted — that he put difficulties in the way of her marriage — and, finally, she requested the appointment of a suitable ambassador, 'with sufficient means of subsistence.' As regards this latter point, it appears that De Puebla's position was not an agreeable one. • He is always complaining. He begs his sovereign 'to give him enough to have always 'something to eat; '—begs that his salary may be paid;—states that if he had accepted Henry's offers, he would be in a different position from that in which he is placed;—complains that he has spent all his property in the service of the king; and begs, therefore, at least for his salary, it having remained unpaid since Isabella's death.*

The correspondence undoubtedly shows that Henry had obtained great influence over De Puebla; and confirms Bacon's statements that the King 'had a great dexterity in getting 'suddenly into the bosom of ambassadors of foreign princes, if 'he liked the men, insomuch as he would many times communicate with them of his own affairs—yea, and employ 'them in his service;' and that he contented them 'with 'courtesy, reward, and privateness; so that they did ever write 'to their superiors in high terms concerning his wisdom and art 'of rule—nay, when they returned, they did commonly 'maintain intelligence with him, such a dexterity he had to 'impropriate to himself all foreign instruments.'

Such was the character of the agent who, in 1488, entered on the marriage negotiation; and at the very outset, it appears that the principal object of Ferdinand and Isabella was to engage Henry in an alliance against France. With his habitual caution, Henry endeavoured to avoid every engagement of this kind; but eventually the Treaty of March 27th, 1489, was concluded, by the Sixth Article of which it was promised that 'as 'often and whenever Ferdinand and Isabella make war with 'France, Henry shall do the same, and conversely;' and by

* The same complaint is made by Don Pedro (p. 179.), by the sub-prior De Santa Cruz (p. 202.), and by Estrada (p. 380.).

the Seventeenth Article, a marriage was agreed on between Katharine and Arthur Prince of Wales. This treaty was ratified the following day by Ferdinand and Isabella, and by Henry on the 20th of September, with additional clauses, by which it was stipulated that 'neither party is to make peace 'with the King of France in any circumstance whatever, 'without the consent of the other;' and further, 'that the 'Princess is to be sent to England as soon as she has completed the twelfth year of her age, and the Prince of Wales 'his fourteenth year.'

In the course of the negotiation, Henry invited the ambassadors to visit the Prince of Wales; and De Puebla states that 'on our arrival we discovered such excellent qualities in the 'Prince of Wales as are quite incredible' (he was then about twenty months old). They were also asked to see the Prince naked, and afterwards asleep. 'He appeared to us so admirable 'that whatever praise, commendation, or flattery any one might 'be capable of speaking or writing would only be truth in this 'case. . . . We also went at an unexpected hour to the Queen, 'whom we found with thirty-two companions of angelical 'appearance; and all we saw there seemed very magnificent, 'and in splendid style, as was suitable for the occasion.'

One of the great objects which Ferdinand and Isabella had in view in contracting the English alliance, as against France, was the restitution of Roussillon and Cerdana. But with the shameless duplicity of the age, they soon afterwards entered into direct negotiation with France, for the same object, on opposite conditions; and on the 8th of January, 1493, they concluded with Charles VIII. a treaty,* by which the latter engaged to restore those provinces, in return for which the Spanish sovereigns agreed to the following stipulations:—

1. They bound themselves 'to assist the King of France 'against all his enemies, without exception, and *in particular* 'against the English, . . . as long as they shall be at war with' Charles.

2. They engaged 'their Royal word, and faith as Christians, 'not to conclude, or permit to be concluded, any marriage of 'their children *with any member of the Royal Family of* 'England, . . . without previously obtaining the express permission and consent of' Charles.

Thus between 1489 and 1493 the state of the case was completely altered. The Treaty of 1489 was a dead letter; and in the copy of that treaty, preserved at Simancas, Mr. Bergenroth finds the signatures of Ferdinand and Isabella to the ratifications cut off. In extenuation of their proceedings in this

matter, Ferdinand and Isabella stated that Henry had neither signed *, nor sworn to, nor delivered the treaties; but still they announced that they were ready to conclude a fresh alliance, if Henry desired it.

There is no evidence in the Simancas records that Henry took umbrage at the rupture. But, in truth, he had been equally faithless to the engagement contracted with the Spanish sovereigns in 1489, by concluding peace with Charles VIII. at Etaples†, in 1492; and he possibly bore in mind how the marriage of the King of the Romans with the Duchess of Brittany, celebrated by proxy, with the peculiar formalities recorded by Bacon, had been broken off. Besides this, Henry could afford to wait. The Italian campaign of Charles VIII., who, as Bacon expresses it, ‘conquered the realm of Naples, and lost it again in a kind of felicity of a dream,’ had begun seriously to alarm the Spanish sovereigns, in common with the rulers of the other Italian states. The result was the League signed at Venice in March 1495‡, on the part of Spain, Austria, Rome, Milan, and the Venetian Republic, the professed object of which was the preservation of the estates and rights of the Confederates. An abstract of the Articles of this league is given by Mr. Bergenroth; but the Simancas copy does not appear to contain the secret Articles which Mr. Prescott states embodied a stipulation that Maximilian and Ferdinand should invade France, and their expenses be defrayed by subsidies from the Allies.

Henry’s accession to the League was a desirable object, and De Puebla was instructed to ask for it, and at the same time desired to reopen the marriage negotiation. The Pope Alex-

* Ferdinand afterwards became aware that the Royal signature was not customary to treaties in England. (P. 136.)

† There is some confusion in Hume’s dates of these transactions. He makes the cession of Roussillon and Cerdana precede the Treaty of Etaples. The dates were: Treaty of Etaples, 1492. (Dumont, *Corps Dip.*, vol. iii. Pt. 2. p. 291.), and the Roussillon Treaty, 1493.

‡ This important treaty is not given either in Rymer or Dumont, nor is it included in De Marten’s Catalogue (*Guide Diplom.*). In both of the former collections the accession of Henry is however included. The treaty will be found in Lünig (*Codex Ital. Dipl.*, vol. i. p. 111.). Its text is not given in Guicciardini, Bembo, Zurita, or Daru, quoted by Prescott; nor in Belcarius, or Paulus Iovius, quoted by Sismondi. Most of these writers allude vaguely to secret articles. Zurita (vol. v. p. 63., Saragossa, 1610), and Le Bret (*Staatsgeschichte der Republ. Venedig*, vol. ii. p. 821. Riga, 1775) expressly state that the league was really against France.

ander VI. also pressed Henry to enter the League, but the latter raised characteristic objections to a step which would commit him in the matter of expense; and it was not until 1496 that Henry ratified his act of accession to the treaty, on condition that he should be exempted from the clauses as to mutual succours of men and money.

So far, therefore, as the relations between Henry and Ferdinand were concerned, the marriage negotiation was now free to proceed; and on the 1st of October 1496, a second treaty was concluded. The Pope's dispensation was requested on account of the youth of the parties—and De Puebla wrote of the treaty, 'God has evidently done it; for there being so many persons in the Council, and about the person of Henry, who receive pensions from France, it would have been beyond human power to bring the business to a satisfactory conclusion.' In the same despatch he stated that the Queen and Queen Mother wish the Princess to practise speaking French, as 'they do not speak Latin, still less Spanish.' 'They also wish that the Princess should accustom herself to drink wine. The water of England is not drinkable, and even if it were, the climate would not allow the drinking of it.' Don Pedro also wrote, 'I take the liberty to say that it would be a good thing if she were to come soon, in order to accustom herself to the way of life in this country, and to learn the language. On the other hand, when one sees and knows the nature of the people in this island, we cannot deny the grave inconveniences of her coming to England before she is of age.' In March 1499, Katharine herself ratified De Puebla's acts, and the nuptial ceremony was performed *per verba de presenti* at Bewdley, in May of the same year, De Puebla being proxy for the Princess. The nation in general seem to have approved the marriage, and great festivities were announced. The Court of England was already noted for splendour and for beauty. Puebla wrote:—

'The King and Queen wish very much that the ladies who are to accompany the Princess of Wales shall be of gentle birth, and beautiful, or at least that none of them should be ugly; and as to the Princess's suite, the King of England wishes it to be as small as possible, for she will be attended, and obeyed, and loved by the first noblemen and ladies of the kingdom.'

Ferdinand and Isabella were not, however, satisfied with this ceremonial, and not unreasonably expressed a wish that the principals should go through the ceremony once when they met, 'as such ceremonies are generally performed in honour of the sacrament of marriage;' and it also appears that it was

usual, when marriages took place by dispensation on account of the youth of the parties, that they should be performed over again, on their attaining the legitimate age. De Puebla, however, only extorted Henry's consent to this repetition of the ceremony, by pointing out that it would save the expense of an embassy to Spain, an argument which failed not to have due weight with Henry. De Puebla then hurried off to the Prince, who was then in Wales; and the Bishop of Lincoln, after raising some objections on the score that the marriage was clandestine, eventually consented to perform the ceremony. De Puebla in describing the event to his Sovereigns, states:—

‘To describe all the honour shown to me would be impossible. As proxy of the Princess of Wales, I was placed at table above the Prince, and at his right hand. All the dishes were presented to me first, and in general more respect was paid to me than I had ever before received in my life.’

Such was the commencement of the unhappy connexion of Katharine of Arragon with the Royal House of England, which was destined in after times to lead to events the most momentous in our history. There was a melancholy fitness in the unusual incidents that accompanied this marriage. This intriguing old emissary of doubtful reputation, deformed in body, corrupted in mind, acting as representative and proxy of an illustrious Princess, young in years and as yet free from these disastrous ties, was no unlikely omen of those incidents which eventually threw so dark a colour over the close of her life. Nor can we here refrain from drawing the contrast which must occur to the mind of every reader, between these inauspicious nuptials, and the event which has so recently stirred the heart of the people of England with raptures of hope, admiration, and joy.

Meanwhile arrangements were in progress for sending the Princess Katharine to England. Her suite was appointed, amongst them being ‘two slaves to attend on the maids of honour,’ and also a ‘sweeper.’ As to the preparations which were being made in England, Isabella wrote to De Puebla, ‘We do not wish that our daughter should be the cause of any loss to England; on the contrary, we desire that she should be the source of all kinds of happiness, as we hope she will be with the help of God.’ She, therefore, begged that expenses might be moderated, adding, ‘We ardently implore him (Henry) that the substantial part of the festival should be his love.’ The preparations for the reception must, at all events, have been on a liberal scale, for we find one of the secretaries writing to Spain, ‘I tell you as many as like may come with the

‘Princess of Wales, and none of them will die with hunger. If they die it will be from too much eating, such a stock of provisions is laid in that nothing will be wanting.’ The Princess finally arrived at Plymouth on the 2nd of October 1501, where, as the Licentiate Alcares writes to her mother, ‘She could not have been received with greater rejoicings if she had been the Saviour of the world.’ On her way to London she was met by Henry and the Prince of Wales. Spanish etiquette would have hindered the Princess from conversing with either of them till the day of marriage. As might be expected, Henry overruled the objection, and himself performed the double introduction.

The real marriage took place at St. Paul’s on the 14th of November 1501; and Henry, in announcing it to Ferdinand and Isabella, states that both he and the Prince ‘have much admired her beauty, as well as her agreeable and dignified manners.’ To this he added his prayer that the royal parents would ‘banish all sadness from their minds. Though they cannot now see the face of their gentle daughter, they may be sure that she has found a second father, who will constantly watch over her happiness, and never permit her to want anything that he can procure for her.’ (P. 264.) The sequel will show how far Henry fulfilled the pledges thus given, but we must proceed with the events in their historical order.

The marriage, as we have said, took place November 14th, 1501. Four months later, on April 2nd, 1502, Katharine Princess of Wales was a widow of barely sixteen years of age, and her life was cast entirely amongst strangers. Yet the first paper amongst the Simancas records, which follows in date the death of Prince Arthur her husband, — a document, too, which emanated from her own parents, — makes her from the very outset a victim of political views and political intrigues. The document to which we allude is the instruction addressed to the Duke de Estrada, who was immediately on the Prince’s death sent as Spanish ambassador to England. In this instruction he was desired to reclaim Katharine’s marriage-portion, or rather the instalment already paid; to demand the payment of her dowry; and lastly, to beg Henry to send the Princess to Spain. So far all was straightforward enough; but in another and separate instruction bearing the same date, Estrada was desired to conclude with Henry a marriage between Katharine and his other son, who had already succeeded to the dignity of Prince of Wales, and was one day to mount the throne of England as King Henry VIII. The good faith which inspired these instructions may be gathered from the following passage

in a subsequent despatch. 'It is very necessary in order that you may the more successfully negotiate the business, that you should speak immediately to the King of England about her coming over here Do this in such a way that he may believe we are desirous of it.'

The key to the policy thus pursued by the Spanish sovereigns is contained in a most interesting letter from Queen Isabella to the Duke de Estrada (p. 272.), which, but for its length, we should gladly transfer to our pages. The French King was threatening Milan and the Spanish possessions in Italy, and was, moreover, collecting forces on the frontier near Perpignan. Ferdinand and Isabella were therefore desirous to invoke the assistance of Henry; and, as an additional inducement, hopes were held out to him that he would thus be enabled to recover Guienne and Normandy. A gentle pressure was, at the same time, brought to bear upon Henry, in the shape of proposals for the departure of Katharine, involving, as it necessarily would, the loss of the remainder of her marriage-portion. With this object, the Duke de Estrada was desired to say to Henry —

'That the greater her loss and affliction, the more reason is there for her to be near her parents, as well for her consolation as on account of her age. . . . Besides, the Princess can show the sense of her loss better here, and give freer vent to her grief, because the customs of this country better permit it than do those of Spain. "We cannot endure that a daughter whom we love should be so far from us when she is in affliction."

All this reads admirably; but the sincerity of the language above quoted may be judged by a subsequent passage, in which Estrada is told to make preparations for Katharine's departure, but in so doing to make use of his ostensible preparations as '*demonstrations of departure*, and for nothing beyond, unless it be a case of necessity;' and further, that 'the one object of this business is to bring the betrothal to a conclusion, . . . for then all our anxiety will cease, and we shall be able to seek the aid of England against France, for it is the most efficient help that we can have.'

The case was indeed urgent, as there seemed to be every probability that the French King would become master of Italy. The marriage was, accordingly, pushed forward; and by the 24th of September, 1502, Henry was pledged so far in the matter as to have prepared the draft of the conditions of the contract. We must ask our readers to bear this date in mind, as bearing on the most remarkable episode in the whole transaction.

It will be remembered that amongst the demands ostensibly put forward by the Spanish sovereigns was one for the return of the portion of Katharine's marriage-settlements already paid down — a demand little likely to be acceptable to Henry. There were also further questions concerning her dowry, and the balance of the marriage-portion still due; and all these were certain to act as powerful inducements with Henry to retain Katharine in England by one means or another. In November 1502, a few months after the death of Prince Arthur, his mother, Queen Elizabeth, followed him to the grave. It seems scarcely credible that Henry at once formed the project of *himself marrying the Princess Katharine*. His own overtures are, it is true, not contained in the Simancas correspondence; but that they were made, in one shape or another, seems scarcely open to doubt, from the following passages from an important despatch, which Isabella addressed to De Estrada, April 11th, 1503: —

'The Doctor' (De Puebla) 'has also written to us concerning the marriage of the King of England with the Princess . . . saying that it is spoken of in England. But as this would be a very evil thing, one never seen, and the mere mention of which offends the ears, we would not for anything in the world that it should take place. Therefore, if anything be said to you about it, speak of it as a thing not to be endured.'

Further on, Estrada is told that Henry '*must be made to know* that if he have any hope of marrying the Princess, on 'no account whatever can such a thing be.'

One would willingly hope that the proposal was not made by Henry, but strange notions as to marriage were entertained in those days. As an instance, we would cite Henry VIII.'s mission to Rome, in 1528, when his agents were instructed to ascertain whether the Pope 'can dispense with the king *to have two wives, and the children of both legitimate*'* — a question which actually appears to have been answered in the affirmative by the Pope.

Isabella, at all events, dismissed the unnatural proposal made to her, in the way it deserved. She felt, however, that her daughter was no longer safe with Henry, 'being the man he is,' as she expressed herself, and Estrada was told to make preparations for her departure. He was still however authorised to suspend the preparations if he could bring about the betrothal, and he was instructed to inform Henry that the Princess's parents had consented to the marriage, the previous

* Herbert, Henry VIII., p. 224.

one *not* having been consummated, — a point on which they had had doubts, as appears from their instructions to Estrada on the death of Prince Arthur.

The passages we have quoted above are to be found in a most interesting despatch, from which we must add the following extract:—

‘Most certainly if there had been in our kingdoms a-like Princess, the daughter of the King of England, who had come hither in the way that the Princess, our daughter, has gone to England, and if we had had to treat respecting her betrothal with our son, we would have guarded the honour of his daughter more jealously than even if she had been our own. And with much love and a right good will would we have done all that in such a case would have had to be done, without making such turnings and twistings in the business. If, in truth, we had acted otherwise in such a case, the King of England would have had much reason to complain of us; but it seems to us that in this case he does not value the connexion so much as he ought to value it, and that he does not even wish to conclude the business at all. Yet since the King of England, taking example from what we would do, ought to regard the honour of the Princess as identical with his own, you must yourself see what honour would be done to the Princess and to us, if she, being a woman, and such a Princess as she is, should have to stay waiting in England, and be thereby made to appear as if she were asking and wishing for the said marriage.’ (P. 298.)

Isabella was not, however, content with these steps. In view of the royal exigencies, she instructed Estrada to suggest to Henry a marriage with her niece, the widowed Queen of Naples. We shall see hereafter how this overture was received by Henry.

In the meanwhile, on the 23rd of June 1503, and little more than two months subsequent to the date of Isabella’s despatch, a treaty was signed between Henry, and Ferdinand, and Isabella, for the marriage of Katharine to Henry Prince of Wales; by Article I. of which, both parties engaged to ask from the Pope a dispensation, owing to the previous marriage *having been consummated*; and by Article II. it was stipulated that ‘if the aforesaid dispensation be obtained,’ a marriage should be contracted within two months after ratification. On the 23rd of August, Ferdinand instructed his ambassador at Rome to act conjointly with the English ambassador in asking for the dispensation, and stating that the marriage had *not* been consummated; ‘but as the English are much disposed to cavil, it has seemed to be more prudent to provide for the case as if it had not been so, and the dispensation must be in perfect keeping with the said clause.’ The treaty was

ratified by Spain, on the 23rd June, 1503, and this step was immediately followed by a requisition addressed to Henry by Ferdinand, for succours against France, the French having actually entered the Spanish realm. 'Tell Henry,' says Isabella to Estrada, that 'if he will but set his hand to the work, we will be content to aid him to recover at our own cost 'Guienne and Normandy.' And the case was looked upon as so urgent, that Estrada was also desired to *urge the Princess* to raise money on her jewels and plate for the despatch of troops, *who should be enlisted in her own name.*

We must now return to the question as to the dispensation, so material to the subsequent discussion of the validity of the marriage of Henry VIII. On this matter the following documents exist at Simancas:—1. A bull of Pope Julius II., dated December 26th, 1503, authorising the marriage, although the previous one 'had perhaps been consummated.*' 2. Ferdinand and Isabella's despatch of June 26th, 1504, to Estrada, saying that their ambassador reported that the dispensation had been granted by the Pope, who was delaying to send it in writing to England, until the English embassy arrived. 3. A letter from Julius II. to Henry† (July 6th, 1504), stating that he never intended to withhold the dispensation, but had delayed only to consider the subject fully, and that it would be sent to England by Robert Sherbourne. 4. A despatch from Estrada, August 27th, 1504, saying that the dispensation had arrived, and that Henry sent it to him to show to the Princess. Some confusion is here evident, for on the 23rd of October, De Puebla wrote, that the dispensation had not arrived, but a brief, of which he enclosed a copy. 5. A letter from Ferdinand to Henry (November 24th, 1504) sending the Pope's dispensation for the marriage. 6. A letter from Henry to the Pope (November 28th, 1504), stating that Sherbourne had returned to England without the dispensation, and repeating his request that it might be delivered. 7. A letter to Henry from the Bishop of Worcester, dated from Rome, March 17th, 1505, stating that 'the King will already have learnt by the Apostolic Brief' that the Pope had commanded him to go to England with the original bull of dispensation. 'It had grieved His Holiness,' said the bishop, 'to learn that

* Mr. Bergenroth gives only an abstract of this paper, which seems to be the same as the bull exhibited on behalf of Queen Katharine, in which the words are '*forsan consummarissetis.*' (Herbert, p. 236.)

† A copy of this letter, certified in Spain, was produced at the divorce proceedings, and is printed by Herbert, p. 247.

'copies had been sent from Spain to England of the bull which under secrecy had been sent to Queen Isabella only for her consolation when on her death-bed.'

The bishop's statements are fully confirmed by a letter from Julius to Henry dated February 22nd, 1505, which is not amongst the Simancas records, but of which Lord Herbert gives a copy (p. 248.), and in which it is stated that 'Nos dispensationem illam . . . concessimus, ac super ea; sub bulla plumbea literas expediri fecimus.' The communication to Isabella is explained, and Henry is told, 'bullam igitur originalem apud nos servatam Serenitati Tuae per eundem Episcopum Wigornensem . . . decrevimus mittere.'

These documents are very interesting as bearing on the question as to Henry VIII.'s divorce. Mr. Froude, in referring to the legal proceedings in the matter states *,—

'The weight of the king's claim had, by the perverse ingenuity of the lawyers, been laid in certain informalities and defects in the original bull of dispensation, which had been granted by Julius II., for the marriage of Henry and Katharine. At the moment when the Legate's court was about to be opened, a copy of a brief was brought forward, bearing the same date as the bull, exactly meeting the objection. The authenticity of this brief was open on its own merits to grave doubts, and suspicion becomes certainty, when we find it was dropped out of the controversy, so soon as the immediate object was gained for which it was produced.'

Now, as to the brief in question, Lord Herbert states † that when Henry VIII. notified to the Emperor his intentions regarding the divorce, the latter exhibited 'the pretended original breve,' and offered Henry's agents a certified copy; and that it was in vain that they asked for the original as being 'a jewel belonging to the king and his queen, and not to be detained by any others from them.' In the divorce proceedings, however, Katharine's advocates produced the brief in the shape of a copy officially certified in Spain ‡: but it was contended that no such document was to be found in the book of briefs at Rome; and additional doubt as to its authenticity must now exist, as it appears that the brief is not found at Simancas either in original or in copy.§ But as regards the dispensation, in whatever form it may have

* Vol. i. p. 159.

† Herbert, p. 226.

‡ Printed by Herbert, p. 238. In the brief, the word '*consummaveritis*,' is substituted for the words '*forsan consummavissetis*' in the bull.

§ For all that can be said in favour of the brief, see Lingard, vol. iv. p. 589.

been conveyed, the documents which we have referred to as existing at Simancas seem undoubtedly to supply a chain of evidence of the *bona fides* of the transaction, and to prove that, so far as the principals were concerned, such a dispensation was actually granted as was considered at the time to justify the marriage.

Returning, however, to the Simancas correspondence, it appears that from the time of the marriage-treaty until the year 1509, where Mr. Bergenroth concludes his volume, the conduct of Henry VII. towards Katharine alternated between kindness and cruel neglect according as his relations with foreign Powers, or his prospect of obtaining the balance of her marriage-portion, influenced his policy or his interests. The *status* of the marriage itself was peculiar. In March, 1505, in a public proclamation, the King speaks of it as 'already concluded.' In June, Prince Henry himself signs a formal protest* against its validity as having been contracted during his legal minority, and this protest he appears to have delivered in the presence of De Puebla and of Katharine herself! And even as late as September, 1507, we find De Puebla writing to the Spanish Secretary of State that the marriage 'is not valid as a marriage *per verba de presenti*, because the Prince was not of age, and this defect 'has not been dispensed with. But as soon as the dower 'arrives the marriage *per verba de presenti* and the wedding 'shall take place.' All this is very contradictory, and Henry's tone towards the Princess does not make the matter much more clear, for in April, 1507, Katharine informed her father that the King had told her very positively that he no longer regarded himself and Prince Henry as bound by the marriage-treaty, because the marriage-portion was not paid; upon this the Princess inquired of De Puebla whether Henry was legally entitled to renounce the marriage, and he answered in the affirmative. Again in a conversation reported by Katharine to her father on October 4th, 1507, Henry gave her to understand that there was nothing done which need prevent Ferdinand on his side, and Henry on his, from disposing of their children in another manner. It appears, however, that though prepared to break off the marriage, Henry must have threatened to retain the Princess; and we read, not without sympathy, the following passage in Ferdinand's instructions to Membrilla, one of his agents in England:—

'For the love I bear the Princess, and the esteem in which I hold her, are so great, that if such a thing were to happen, which God

* Herbert, p. 249.

forbid, I would risk my person and my kingdom, and that of my daughter the Queen, with the greatest readiness, in order to make a worse war on the King of England than on the Turks. The King of England must keep faith in this matter, or, if not, the world may perish.' (P. 460.)

With her dearest interests thus in a state of uncertainty, the personal position of Katharine was in other respects pitiable. Immediately after Prince Arthur's death we find her reduced to borrowing money. Her health suffered from anxiety, and as she says from the absence, sometimes for a year, of letters from her parents. She lived much in seclusion, apparently in deference to the wishes of her Spanish attendants. Constantly in want, she tells her father 'to consider how she is in debt, not 'for extravagant things, but for food. The King of England 'will not pay anything, though she has asked him with tears.' She presses Ferdinand to pay her marriage-portion, 'for the 'contempt shown her when it does not arrive is so great.' She states that her women had received no money since they had been in England; that she could not even pay the expenses of her couriers to Spain, and that as regards herself 'no woman 'of whatever station in life can have suffered more than she has;' and she complains of the cruelty of permitting her so seldom to see the Prince of Wales, although he lived in the same house, she not having seen him for four months! Even the trustees of Isabella remonstrated with Ferdinand on the subject, stating 'it is a sad thing to hear of the Princess and not to help her,' adding that her poverty reflected dishonour on the name of Ferdinand and Isabella. This, too, at a time when Ferdinand had sent the youthful Princess credentials to act as his ambassador*, in which capacity we find her endeavouring to cipher her despatches, and fearing that her attempts will cause her father and his minister to laugh; her colleague being De Puebla, whom she tells Ferdinand she could not trust; and when, as she states, 'things were daily becoming worse and 'her life more insupportable. It is impossible for me to endure 'any longer what I have already gone through, and am still 'suffering, from the unkindness of this king.'

Such is the picture which the Simancas records give of the position of this young princess, the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, the aunt of Charles V., and the future wife of Henry

* The letters of Katharine to her father are full of deep interest; they show much ability, and justify the tribute paid to her by Erasmus. (Prescott, ii. p. 166.) Mr. Bergenroth states, that though her style is heavy, and the spelling sometimes incorrect, her letters are always clear and decided. (*Introd.*, p. xxxiii.)

VIII. 'Everything,' as Ferdinand wrote to Membrilla (August 7th, 1508), 'seems to prove that it would be better to break 'entirely with Henry,' although he added a hope, not destined to be realised, that the Prince of Wales would show himself more amenable to reason.*

From this sad picture we must turn to Henry and his own projects, and to the suggestion made to him by Isabella of a marriage with the Queen of Naples. Henry appears to have jumped at the proposal. De Puebla asks for her picture, as the King must be certified as to her appearance, 'for if she 'were ugly and not beautiful, the King would not have her for 'all the treasures in the world, nor would he dare to take her, 'the English thinking so much as they do about personal 'appearance.' And Mr. Bergenroth gives in full the curious and minute instructions which Henry addressed to the agents who were sent by him to ascertain every particular regarding the Queen of Naples, the nature of which will be understood when we state that amongst other points they were 'to 'endeavour to speak with her fasting, and that she may tell 'them some matters at length, so that they may see whether 'her breath be sweet.' To which the emissaries reported, in reply, that they 'could never come near to her fasting, 'but at other times have approached her visage as nigh as they 'conveniently could, but never felt any savour of spices, and 'believe her to be of a sweet savour.' Bacon might truly observe of these instructions that 'if the King had been young, 'a man would have judged him to be amorous; but being 'ancient, it ought to be interpreted that sure he was very 'chaste, for that he meant to find all things in one woman, and 'so to settle his affections without ranging.' But the match was not to be. Henry found that in regard to money — no slight matter with him — matters were not on the satisfactory footing he had supposed, and the negotiation seems to have dropped.

His affections, if they may be so called, were not, however, to be long without an object. On the death of Isabella in November, 1504, the Archduke Philip became King of Castile in right of his wife Juana, and it soon became evident that the relations between Ferdinand and his son-in-law were not likely to remain friendly. Ferdinand himself wrote to Henry in June, 1505, a long letter of complaint against Philip; but the quarter to which he addressed himself was unfortunate, and we

* It is remarkable that Bacon does not allude to the negotiations for the second marriage.

find Henry losing no time in making secret inquiries as to the new position of affairs, with a view to his own interests. Circumstances assisted his designs. In January, 1506, a storm cast the King of Castile on the shores of England. Lingard calls his stay in England 'a splendid captivity *'; an account scarcely borne out by Bacon, although he says the commercial treaty then negotiated was called by the Flemings '*intercursus malus*;' but at all events Henry during Philip's stay negotiated a marriage between himself and the Archduchess Margaret, the young King's sister. Eventually, however, the Archduchess could not be induced to accept the proposed match; a strange course for her to take if we are to believe Henry's statement to Maximilian that 'it would not be a thing to be 'wondered at if he, Henry, were to accept one of the great 'and honourable matches *which were daily offered to him on 'all sides.*' A match, however, which was not offered to him was soon to be the object of his hopes.

On the death of Philip shortly after, we find Henry proposing, *through the Princess of Wales*, marriage to her sister Juana, Philip's mad widow, the mother of Charles V., and the heiress of Castile. The knowledge which we have acquired of Henry's character prevents any surprise at the channel which he selected for making his proposals to Ferdinand. The latter, however, readily caught at a fresh means of obtaining influence over Henry; he promised that if Juana married again, it should be to Henry,—intelligence which Henry, to use his own words, learnt with 'rapturous joy.' De Puebla of course recommended the marriage, and wrote —

'There is no king in the world who would make so good a husband to the Queen of Castile, as the King of England, *whether she be sane or insane.* . . . If the insanity of the queen should prove incurable, it would perhaps not be inconvenient that she should live in England. *The English seem little to mind her insanity*, especially since he has assured them that her derangement of mind would not prevent her from bearing children.'

Ferdinand, moreover, promised to do his utmost to persuade Juana to accept the marriage. Our readers will, however, not have forgotten the history of the last days of that unfortunate Princess, bearing about with her the unburied corpse of her husband Philip; and they will be prepared for the last document in Mr. Bergenröth's volume bearing on this subject, in which Ferdinand writes of Juana that 'the state in which she 'is cannot be described by letters; has tried all he could to

* Lingard, vol. iv. p. 330.

‘prevail on her to bury her husband, but has not succeeded. ‘All that can be done will be done in this matter.’ This was in 1508. All that could be done was to be very little. In April 1509, Henry’s death took place; but the conclusion of Mr. Bergenroth’s volume prior to that date saves us the task of pursuing any further this history of heartless selfishness; and we would readily banish from our thoughts the image of Henry, now verging towards his grave, but still eagerly bent on securing as his bride the insane widow of an unburied corpse.

Some compunctions he may have felt at the close of his life. Bacon says that ‘this Solomon of England, *for Solomon also* ‘*was too heavy upon his people in exactions,*’ directed by his will the restitution of monies unjustly taken by his officers. In other words, when the profits of extortion were of no avail to him, he was willing to surrender them to the oppressed. Hume also states that Henry on his death-bed charged his son not to marry Katharine, as the marriage was exposed to insuperable objections. There is, however, no evidence that he took any steps to restore the dowry, for two instalments of which receipts had been signed by himself and his son; and the weight which Henry VIII. attached to his advice may be gathered from the fact that the marriage was solemnised on June 3rd, after full deliberation between the King and his council.

We should have had much pleasure in presenting to our readers, had we not already exceeded our space, some of the documents of great general interest contained in Mr. Bergenroth’s volume. Such, for instance, are the correspondence as to Perkin Warbeck; a letter from Columbus dated February 15th, 1493 (p. 43.); the report of Don Pedro de Ayala on Scotland and James IV. (p. 169.); and a paper of agreement between the cardinals who were to meet in conclave on September 21st, 1503, to select the new pope (p. 310.). All these and many other papers in this volume we must commend to the students of history, who will look forward to the transcripts which will shortly be deposited in the Record Office, as well as to the index which Mr. Bergenroth promises, and which we fervently wish had accompanied his present publication.

- ART. V.—1. *Reports of the Inspectors of Coal Mines to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the year 1860.*
2. *Reports of the Inspectors of Mines to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the year 1861.*
3. *Report of the Commissioner appointed under the Provisions of the Act 5 & 6 Vict. c. 99. to enquire into the Operations of that Act, and into the State of the Population of the Mining Districts.* 1859.
4. *A Voice from the Mines and Furnaces.* By the Rev. WILLIAM FORD VANCE, M.A., Incumbent of Cozeley, Staffordshire. Wolverhampton and London: 1853.

THE physical geography of a country is hardly less clearly marked to the observant traveller by the general aspect of the surface and its occupants than by the colours on the geological map. The inhabitants of the mineral districts of Great Britain are strongly impressed by characteristics common to them all, and though they are discriminated by many diversities of national character and local circumstance, they all bear a closer resemblance to each other than to any of the agricultural or manufacturing populations by which they are surrounded. They have the strongest claims to our interest. None of the laborious classes have contributed more to raise England to the rank she holds in the scale of nations—none endure severer toil, or incur heavier risks. They are distinguished by many fine qualities, and though not free from grave defects, they possess the germs of much undeveloped good. They are yearly increasing in numbers and importance. But it is only in comparatively recent times that their hardships and their dangers have attracted the sympathy of the rest of the community. Some twenty years ago, the public were startled by the revelations of the Commission appointed to inquire into the employment of women and children in mines. The abuses then brought to light were chiefly local, but they drew the attention of the Legislature to the condition of the mining population generally. An experimental Act for 'the better Regulation of Coal and Iron Mines' was passed in 1849. It was renewed, with certain alterations, in 1855, and with further modifications, it was passed into a permanent law in 1860. Besides many special regulations for the salubrity of the mines and the safety of the miners, which we shall notice presently, this Act establishes a system of inspection of mines by Government, and secures the most complete publicity in all cases of

accident. Every casualty must be reported by the manager to the Secretary of State and to the inspector of the district. It is the duty of the inspectors to enforce the penalties imposed by the Act in cases of negligence; and their reports, containing the melancholy catalogue of casualties, are annually laid before Parliament. Before the Act was finally passed, Mr. Tremenhoe was commissioned to report on its operation; and the able pamphlet before us contains the result of his observations, and his suggestions for the safety of the miner below ground and his comfort above. Little, however, hitherto has been written about the mining population. Special appeals have occasionally been made on their behalf; and of these we notice 'A Voice from the Mines,' as a favourable specimen. But the writers dwell only on the evils they desire to remedy, and present a picture in which they note only the shadows. 'Our Coal-fields and our Coal-pits, by an underground Traveller,' gives a lively and instructive account of the work-people in what is commonly called the Newcastle coal-basin. But we still want popular descriptions of the many other fields of underground labour, and this want we propose in some slight degree to supply in the present article. It would far exceed our limits to combine in one sketch the many points of resemblance and the distinctive differences of our English, Scotch, and Welsh coal-fields. For the present we shall confine our attention to the 'Black Country,' the name popularly given to those portions of the Midland district from which verdure has retreated before the encroachments of the manufacturer. The Black Country possesses ironstone in combination with the fuel necessary to smelt it, and preeminently deserves its name; for no country where coal only is raised can vie with the dense fuliginous blackness of one where coal is also employed in the smelting and manufacturing of iron. It is unfortunate for the lovers of the picturesque that the disruption of the earth's crust, to which we owe the most striking features of the landscape, also brings within human reach the strata of coal and iron; and thus many of the regions which nature has done most to adorn, are those which she most powerfully tempts man to deface. But till the completion of the steam-engine had secured the triumph of coal, and had given a fresh impetus to the operations of the miner and the manufacturer, the effect on the landscape was inappreciable. The thin blue smoke which curled above the woods proceeded from the fires of the charcoal-burners. The coal and ironstone were got near the surface 'by open work,' or were drawn up from shallow pits by wooden gins, and strings of mules and pack-horses brought the materials to

the tiny furnaces, whose bellows were worked by the neighbouring rivulets. From Wellington to Birmingham there extended, with only occasional interruptions of cultivation, a wild heath, partially covered with old oaks. Men are yet alive who remember, as boys, to have witnessed the demolition of the last of these veterans of the forest. Dudley Castle towered over views as extensive, and not less rural, than those of Belvoir; and all the region, which is now a wilderness of flame and brick-work, was what Cannock Chase still is, but in the progressive development of its collieries will soon cease to be.

Yet to the painter's eye the Black Country has beauties of its own. The bastion-like furnaces, crowned with circular galleries and turrets breathing flames, are combined in striking groups with chimneys tall as towers, and are repeated in the various distances till lost in the murky horizon. Volumes of smoke mingle in grand masses with the rolling clouds. A lake, to the eye as black and solemn as Avernus, though in fact only a vast reservoir to supply the engines, reflects the scene in its still mirror; and a striking foreground is supplied by the gigantic fragments of disused machinery which bestrew the bank. It is a picture such as Martin loved to paint, suggesting the ideas of preternatural power and unearthly desolation. And sometimes a sequestered nook presents a softer scene. The sunny turf, the glassy stream, and the rich foliage of the wood, surmounted by the smoke and flame of the neighbouring furnace, might furnish a Danby with a hint for the blissful Limbo, where Dante found his pagan models in the occupation of a meaner paradise, beyond the reach, yet still within sight, of the penal fires. But few lovers of nature or art can take pleasure in landscape scenery which is not associated with ideas of enjoyment. Claude's bewitching warmth and sunshine are always preferred to Poussin's grander compositions; and so disagreeable is the association of smoke, that we shall risk losing the reader's sympathy at the outset if we venture to urge more in favour of the beauties of colliery.

The 'Black Country,' however, has points of interest which no one can dispute. Not the pyramids of Egypt, nor the dikes of Holland, bear more conspicuous testimony to human energy and perseverance. To 'a traveller underground' the large shafts of the coal districts, sunk to a depth of 1,500 and even 2,000 feet—the vast extent of the subterranean labyrinth in which the men are employed—the ingenious expedients for ventilation—and the prodigious power and cost of the machinery employed for 'winding' and for pumping the water,—all these far surpass the antiquated appliances of the Midland district. But on the

surface the miner of the ironstone districts has impressed his mark much more visibly. The natural aspect of the country is changed by countless mounds, as large as good-sized hills, which have been gradually formed round the pits, by the accumulation of 'spoil,' or rubbish which has been brought up from below. The soil thus formed is by no means devoid of fertility; and having been recently moved, it is well adapted for planting whenever the time comes for bringing it again under cultivation. Near the furnaces are huge mounds of a different and perfectly sterile material. This is the 'cinder' of the furnace, a kind of artificial lava formed chiefly by the combination of the flux and the clay of the ironstone. It accumulates very rapidly — probably at the rate of two to one of every ton of iron made; and somewhere it must remain to cumber the ground, for no extensive use has yet been found for it, except to supply materials for the roads, and ballast for the railways. It is a vitrified substance impervious to wet, and has sometimes been moulded into bricks as it oozed red-hot from the furnace. When cut it presents a great diversity of colour, and takes a high polish. A patent has been registered for working it into chimney-pieces; but neither of these modes of using it has been generally adopted, and the problem of turning it to a profitable account still remains to be solved. Furnaces were usually built in a hollow to afford facilities for carrying the materials to the level at which they are cast in; but this advantage is neutralised by the necessity of conveying the cinder from below to some place of deposit; and it is now quite as usual to build furnaces on a plain, with a 'lift' to raise the materials to the gallery at their top.

In convenient proximity to the furnaces is the coke-hearth, with its blazing fires and black stream of driving smoke, while hard by, in heavier eddies, curls a yellow earthy volume, which proceeds from huge heaps of ironstone undergoing the process of calcining. The very ground seems on fire, like the representations of Pandemonium, in an old edition of 'Paradise Lost.' Far and near the surface is studded with buildings. Every pit has its winding apparatus, its engine-house, and tall chimney. But nothing looks neat, nothing is in perfect repair. Houses—even those of some importance—are girded and cramped together with iron; sheds, stables, cottages, seem stuck into the ground like pins into a pin-cushion, at various angles, accordingly as the subtraction of the minerals below has caused a subsidence of the surface.

The smelting furnaces are the centre of activity, and to them tramways and railways converge, bearing strings of trucks

loaded with materials; and the 'bridge-house'—as it has been called, because it connects the top of the furnaces with the furnace yard—is full of men breaking the limestone which serves for flux, and wheeling the calcined ironstone to the 'filling holes.' Under the furnace-manager the charge of the upper part of the furnaces belongs to a contractor called the Bridge-Stocker. He employs a gang of men, women, and boys, and also keeps horses, for the purpose of supplying the furnaces with the necessary materials; and as much depends on his care and regularity, it is found best to give him an interest in the work by paying him so much per ton on the produce. The office of the 'fillers' who work under him, requires watchfulness. They relieve each other by turns; night and day, with unremitting regularity, the furnaces must be fed. The work is hard, but ought to be unattended with danger. The 'filling holes' or orifices by which the materials are poured down the throat of the furnace are not larger than is necessary for the purpose: a man who was 'in liquor' would not be suffered to remain at the post; but man is ever making danger for himself where none exists. One dark night at a Shropshire iron-work, a 'filler' found a barrow improperly left in his way, and, in a moment of passion, he seized it with violence, supposing it to be full, but being empty, it gave way with unexpected facility, and by the force of his own movement he was precipitated into the furnace. The charge was within four feet of the 'filling hole,' and two of his comrades, one of whom nearly sacrificed his life in the effort, succeeded in pulling him out with very little delay. The surgeon was immediately in attendance—but hope or help there was none. The poor man presented a spectacle fearful to behold, but it is believed he suffered little pain. He retained his senses to the last, and during the greater part of the hour for which his life was prolonged his voice was heard in low, rapid, and fervent prayer.

The lower part of the furnace is in the charge of the keepers and the 'stock-taker.' They prepare the sand, form the moulds, superintend the casting, weigh the pigs, and remove 'the cinder.' At casting-time their situation seems full of peril, but they rarely receive any injury, though they may be seen skipping about among rivulets of molten metal with more indifference than a tidy housemaid shows to the water with which she is washing the door-step; and they flit about among sparks and burning fragments of fuel as unconcernedly as a harlequin jumps through a blaze of squibs. It might be supposed that their eyes must be affected by the heat and the glare

of the iron fluid; but we cannot find, on inquiry, that they are subject to blindness, or even to premature decay of sight. Sometimes, indeed, accidents occur: the sand at the tapping-hole gives way, and the molten metal unexpectedly bursts forth. Or it may happen that the 'charge' of the furnace sinks irregularly, arching over, and leaving a hollow such as is often seen at the bottom of an ordinary grate. The vast mass then collapses, and falling suddenly upon the molten cinder, projects it together with no small portion of the blazing contents of the furnace into the 'casting-house.' On such occasions, if anyone happened to be standing near, he would be in imminent peril. Some years ago we witnessed an explosion of this kind of unusual magnitude and violence. The spectacle exceeded the most brilliant firework; but was too closely associated with the painful ideas of loss and danger to excite any emotions of pleasure.

The efficient working of the furnace depends on the power of the blast-engine which blows it, and therefore on the care and vigilance of the men who attend to the fires of the boilers by which the blast-engine is driven. But an ingenious contrivance is creeping into general use, by which the necessity of human intervention in this matter is to a certain extent superseded. The gas evolved by the combustion of the furnace is carried down by tubes to heat the boilers, and thus a circle of causation is completed which is analogous to perpetual motion. The gas heats the boilers which generate the steam, which impels the engine which drives the blast, which blows the furnace which evolves the gas; and so on for ever. And thus, too, the heavy volumes of smoke emitted by the tall chimney of the blast-engine, the densest and blackest of the whole colliery, are diminished to a thin and scarcely perceptible vapour.

In a colliery and iron-work the distribution of the coal is usually made subservient to the manufacture of the iron. The 'sweetest' kinds of coal (the freest from sulphur) are reserved for the smelting furnace, and when it is intended to make the best quality of iron they are further purified by coking. The superior coals less suited to the smelting furnace are sold for household purposes. The inferior kinds are used at the engines, at the pits, and to supply the workman with his allowance of a ton per month. They are also sold to the workhouses and to the poor. But there is nothing in this to alarm the sensibility of the philanthropist. He is probably burning worse railway coal in his own London study, unless he is very particular in selecting, and also in scolding, his coal merchant.

The 'slack,' as the small coal is called, is sold at a reduced

price, though it is larger than the sea-coal usually is when it has reached the metropolis. It is tantalising to see the quantity of good fuel that, under the name of 'coal-dust,' is left to perish on the bank, or to ignite by spontaneous combustion, but there are no cheap means of transporting it to cheer the poor of the southern counties. Of all the methods which have been invented for saving present expense and economising our mineral resources for the future, there is none more promising than the contrivance for consolidating the small coal into coke; but we believe it has not been successfully applied as yet, except where the coals are of a bituminous character.

It is not surprising that the deep mines of modern days have hitherto been preferred for description. In them everything is on a colossal scale, and their every detail is astonishing. They have further acquired a melancholy notoriety by those wholesale catastrophes which can occur only in works of such magnitude. But it is for this reason the more necessary to turn our attention to the less known, but not less important, mines of the older districts which still produce some of the most valuable materials for the iron trade. The various mining districts of Great Britain differ in their geological conditions, and have been developed at different periods, when the theory and practice of mining were totally different; but all are made subject to one common code of regulations, and the peculiarities of each must be studied, if we desire to frame laws which are to be equally applicable to them all.

In one particular, the danger of the workmen, the resemblance is only too strong. The world will not dispense with coal and iron; and were the risks of getting them infinitely greater, men would be found in abundance who would brave them all. Every employment has its danger. 'Danger,' says Massinger, 'is here, is everywhere, our forced companion;' but, excepting those 'who go down to the sea in ships and 'do business in great waters,' no man who follows a peaceful calling is exposed to so many risks as the miner. The annual aggregate of accidents, which used to be estimated at 1,000, averages in the two reports before us about 800. The causes of death are classified under five heads, and the mortality assignable to each is in round numbers as follows:—Accidents in the shaft, 150; explosions, 70; falls of the roof or of minerals, 400; miscellaneous below ground, 130; above ground, 50.

As the minerals in the old ironstone district lie near the surface, the shafts are not deep, and their diameter does not exceed six or seven feet. The areas of the pits are comparatively small, the workmen few, and the 'winding' very slow.

The minerals are raised in 'skips' or baskets, and so at first were the men; but another method is now extensively employed. They insert their legs in certain loops of chain, which they call 'doubles,' and, holding on with their hands to the main chain, they are drawn up to the bank in a cluster, like a swarm of bees. But in the deep mines of the northern districts the shafts were sunk with great difficulty and at enormous cost. It became necessary to enlarge their size, and very desirable to diminish their number; the areas of the pits worked by a pair of shafts were vastly increased, the men employed were multiplied by tens. From three or four times the depth twenty or thirty times the quantity of mineral was to be raised in the same given time. This could be done only by a considerably-increased speed of winding, and thereby was incurred the danger of a collision of the load, whether animate or inanimate, with the sides of the shaft: accordingly to obviate this, cages sliding up and down on guide-rods like the cedar pencil in an old-fashioned case, and much resembling the lifts which are now common in private houses, were contrived. The chain, which did not admit of the rapid rate of winding, was necessarily exchanged for a flat wire rope. But the rope and its fastening are less secure than the chain. Not long ago, in an important colliery, the bolt which connects the rope and the cage gave way, just as the men were lowered to commence their descent. The cage shot downwards with accelerated velocity, unchecked by the friction of the guide-rods. The horror of the bystanders was not greater than their surprise. At the coroner's inquest, which was held shortly afterwards, for, it is needless to say, the men were all killed, no fault could be discovered in the material or the manufacture. Very recently an ingenious invention has been produced, by which the cage is arrested in its descent in case of accident; and, unless this is generally adopted, the 'safety cages' will ill deserve their name.

In the old shallow mines cages are perfectly unnecessary, nor could they be introduced without renovating the plant—an expense which the nearly-exhausted state of the mines renders it impossible to incur; but we should be glad to see it enacted that all shafts sunk in future, should be constructed on the improved principle. Of this prospective legislation no one could complain; but the philanthropist often makes enactments which are virtually retrospective, and disguises from himself their true operation by providing merely that they shall not take effect till some future day.

It is wisely regulated by law that not more than eight men

shall go up or down the shaft at once, and in going down this restriction is endured patiently enough; but in coming up the greatest firmness on the part of the 'hooker-on' is necessary to prevent more than the legal number obtaining a place. On one occasion they endeavoured to overpower the 'hooker-on,' an Irishman notorious for his coolness and courage. They got into the cage, and gave the signal to draw up. He let them go a few yards, and then gave the signal to lower. 'Now,' said he, 'we will play at this game all night, if you like.' It will readily be believed he soon restored order. In all cases, it is made imperative to place above the men's heads a 'bonnet,' or cover of plate-iron, like a huge umbrella, as a safeguard against any falling body that might by mischance be sent down the pit. These covers have the incidental advantage of preventing a mischievous prank that used to be frequently played by the boldest and most unruly of the colliery lads. When the men were all fastened in the loops and ready for the ascent, an active boy would run up the clustered group before he could be caught by the legs, and perch himself on the chain above their heads and out of their reach. There, during the whole ascent, he would enjoy their oaths and threats of vengeance; on reaching the bank, he would spring down before the men could disentangle themselves from the loops, and be out of sight before anyone was ready to inflict chastisement. One day a boy, in performing this feat, got his thumb jammed in between the hook and the ring of the chain: the whole weight of eight men was pressing on the joint. It was the torture of the thumbscrew, and worse; but not one sign of suffering would he give during a slow ascent of 300 feet; he was afraid of the men 'jeering him because he was cotched.' As soon as he could disengage himself he hid his bleeding hand under the other arm and ran off. 'What's the matter with thee?' roared the charter-master; 'come back!' and he set off in chase; but the boy, notwithstanding the cramped position of his hands, distanced his pursuer, and reached the surgeon's in safety. It was not found necessary to amputate the joint. Many accidents occur in the shafts from the want of concert between the hooker-on below, and the banksman and the engineer on the surface, and to prevent these a code of signals is enjoined by the Act. Breaks, too—an ingenious contrivance for preventing the running down of the chain if any accident happens to the engine—have been added to the requirements of the law, and with the best effect.

In spite of many regulations for fencing the pits' mouths, deaths by falling down the shafts are frequent. Many years

ago, we remember to have seen the men, at an unusual hour, issuing slowly from a pit, and moodily straggling homewards. After a fatal accident, it is their invariable custom to abandon the pits for the remainder of the day. On this occasion a poor girl had incautiously come too near the pit's mouth, and, losing her balance, had fallen down the shaft. And sometimes a tragedy occurs which no precaution can prevent. A few months ago, a worthless drunkard ran off deserting his infant child and a wife who only loved him the more for all his ill-usage. The poor woman made no complaint—she applied for no relief—she pined in grief and want till one morning, with her remaining strength, she clambered over the fence of a closed pit. She deliberately threw down her famine-struck child. A charter-master saw her and rushed forward, but came up in time only to hear the rushing sound of her fall down the shaft.

Under the head of Explosions all their fatal consequences are also comprehended. The bad air which assails the miner's life in the pit is of two kinds. In all mines, of whatever class, the air is vitiated by the subtraction of the hydrogen, caused by the respiration of the workmen, the combustion of their lights, and the gases generated by the explosions of the gunpowder used in blasting, as well as by the decomposition of the various impurities which accumulate in the mine. The result is carbonic acid gas, or 'choke-damp.' When the flame of the candle languishes, the vital powers are attacked; when it goes out, there is no safety but in instant flight. But in the coal strata, and also in the ironstone-beds, which are in juxtaposition with the coal, and are permeated by its gases, there also exudes the light carburetted hydrogen, or 'fire-damp.' When this gas is mixed with the atmospheric air in the proportion of one-thirtieth, its presence is notified by the flame of the candle, which immediately dilates and elongates itself, and continues to do so more vigorously as the proportion of gas increases, till it reaches one-fourteenth; at this point the flame propagates itself, but without any violent explosion. As the proportion of gas advances from one-fourteenth, the explosive power increases, till at one-eighth, it attains its maximum. From this point, as the proportion of gas increases, its explosive power declines. At one-sixth it ceases to be inflammable at all. At one-third the candle goes out, and the compound is unfit for respiration. These two gases league together against the collier. When an explosion has done its work of destruction, the 'choke-damp' rises to suffocate those whom the fire has spared, and with such deadly effect, that, in general, the deaths by suffocation greatly

exceed those by fire. The miner's best safeguard is the Davy-lamp, or some one of the many varieties of it, all constructed on the same principle: the flame is enclosed in a very fine wire gauze, through which it will not pass to ignite the gas, while light sufficient for ordinary purposes is transmitted. Before the invention of this lamp the colliers were obliged in fiery mines to work by the dim twilight of a shower of sparks which were struck by the collision of a steel wheel with a row of flints, and which were unattended with danger, for the gas will ignite only by contact with flame. The safety-lamp gives a comparatively good light; and not only is it a preservative against danger, but an infallible gauge of its magnitude; for the amount of noxious gas may be accurately estimated by the phenomena exhibited by the wick. As the gas becomes more inflammable the flame dilates in form and deepens in colour till the wire gauze becoming red hot, as the fierceness of the combustion increases, announces that the explosive power of the gas is approaching the maximum. Very strict rules and regulations enjoin that every pit shall be visited in the morning before the men go down, by the 'fireman' with the Davy-lamp to ascertain that all is safe. And, moreover, the circumstances are specified under which the Davy-lamp shall be used, and when it shall be locked, so that nothing may be trusted to the workmen's discretion.

The quantity of gas emitted by the coal strata varies much in different districts. In the Black Country it is much less, speaking generally, than in the northern coal-fields; but security begets carelessness, and in carelessness there always is danger. In pits considered safe, we have known the gas purposely ignited by the wanton folly of the colliery boys, who amuse themselves with seeing the flame of the sulphur, as they call it, run along the roof. Not long ago a man on striking his pike into the coal-seam, heard the hissing sound which indicates an issue of gas. He applied his candle, expecting the effect which the lamplighter produces by turning on the gas and lighting it—instantly a strong stream of fire curled up his arm and the side of his face, flaying the skin as it passed, and he was lucky to escape with no worse damage. One Monday morning the 'Reeve,' that is to say the foreman, or 'Doggie,' as he is familiarly called, on coming to his pit, found three men waiting for him; and without taking the precaution enjoined by the regulations, persuaded them all to accompany him at once. The pit was known to be a remarkably safe one, and on Saturday night it had been left in perfect order; but an unsuspected change had taken place in the intervening thirty-six hours.

Water had broken into the airway, bringing with it a quantity of earth, which had choked up the passage. The Reeve went on a few yards in advance of the party—his unlighted Davy-lamp in one hand, a flaring tallow candle in the other. As he approached the face of the work a sudden explosion took place, which struck him dead on the spot, and enveloped the other three men in flame. They escaped, but only to die a more lingering and painful death from the effects of the fire.

Unquestionably in certain states of the pit it is highly dangerous to detach the mineral by means of 'blasting.' The catastrophe in the pit near Barnsley was occasioned by a 'shot,' as it is called; and so violent and obstinate was the conflagration which ensued, that no means of subduing it could be devised, but by diverting a neighbouring brook, and sending it down the shaft. It was unfortunately necessary to take this step before the bodies of all the sufferers had been recovered; and it would be difficult to express how much the imaginary horror of this circumstance aggravated the real anguish of bereavement to the survivors. But how far the practice of blasting can be effectually restrained within the limits of safety, either by legislative enactments or the vigilance of overlookers, seems doubtful. The men complain that without it they cannot 'make wages,' and therefore there is on their parts a constant struggle to push its employment beyond the bounds of prudence. We have often wished that ingenious men would turn their attention to the construction of tools and machinery, specially devised for the excavation of minerals. Some efforts of the kind have been made, we believe, but with incomplete success. At the best, the danger of blasting is great. The men handle gunpowder as if it were sand; they deal with the candle as if it were only a lump of tallow; and they throw aside the copper 'skewers,' with which they are provided, and take steel ones, as if they forgot that steel, if it meets flint, will strike a spark.

The 'goaves,' or abandoned workings, which in the northern coal-fields are vast reservoirs for generating noxious gases, are less dangerous in Shropshire, because they are very much smaller, and they are immediately filled up with the earth which falls in as soon as the props are withdrawn; but nevertheless they exude a certain quantity of gas, and we strongly advise that all deserted roads and hollows of every description should be securely walled. In a Shropshire colliery the passage leading to one of these goaves had been cut off from the main gallery by a 'stank,' or dam, only five feet high. This had been done on calculation. It was thought that the regular escape of

a small portion of gas into a remarkably well-ventilated airway was less objectionable than the danger of a sudden explosion of pent-up gas through some unperceived fissure. One day a man clambered over this 'stank,' and entered the deserted passage with a lighted candle in his hand. He was not drunk; he was not mad; no plausible motive for this suicidal act could be conjectured; he himself, for he was not killed on the spot, could not give the slightest account of his purpose, and his comrades could explain the mystery only by saying 'his hour was come.'

The only defence against these noxious gases is a sufficient current of pure air. And the art of ventilation, or the science of pneumatics, as it is somewhat pedantically called in the prospectus of mining colleges, becomes a matter of first-rate importance. In the early days of mining, it was a matter of course that two shafts should be sunk to every pit to secure a thorough draft. By the one, called the 'downcast,' the fresh air was admitted; by the other, the 'upcast,' the foul air was carried off; and the only problem is to force the air, which always pursues its course by the shortest road, to circulate through every part of the workings. In extensive pits the greatest ingenuity has been displayed in putting up partitions to 'split' the currents of air, and by some device to drive a portion of it through every passage. And in smaller pits, though the mechanism is more simple, the principle is the same. The best artificial mode of increasing the volume and the speed of the air, is to construct a furnace, large in proportion to the draft required, at the bottom and sometimes near the top of the upcast shaft. Doors are put up wherever it is necessary to stop the direct passage of the current, in order to make it take a more circuitous route; and to diminish the risk of carelessness, the legislature enjoins that these doors shall be double, and shall be so contrived as to close of themselves. But we have all experienced the propensity of servants to keep open the many spring-doors and other barriers invented to keep the odours of the kitchen from the reception-rooms. It is true the unctuous fumes of roast and fried are not inflammable, and the 'blowing up' which servants have to apprehend is merely metaphorical. But the collier is quite as indifferent to his more real dangers. There is every reason to believe that the tragedy at the Cethin Pit was caused by the omission to shut a door. It has indeed been suggested that the congregating of the men together in one place to eat their dinner, may have impeded the current of air. Additional risk, no doubt, is thus caused, which in future it would be well to avoid; but the practice of the men on that fatal day was probably just what it had always been, and we must look rather to some accidental neglect, combined

perhaps with an unusual escape of gas, for the cause of the disaster.

But even progress has its snares and drawbacks. As the science of artificial ventilation improved, it became a question whether one shaft, divided by a brattice or partition throughout its whole length, might not serve the purpose of two. Even without any such partition, it is a curious fact that the descending column of air and the ascending column of gas form two distinct streams, and never commingle; and when ventilation is farther assisted by a large furnace placed at the bottom of the shaft, a free circulation of air may be maintained, even when there is only this one means of communication with the surface; in fact the ventilation of the unfortunate Hartley Pit was by no means in an unsatisfactory state. Nor indeed does it necessarily follow that because there is only one shaft, there should be only one egress for the workmen. At Hartley there existed a communication, bearing some analogy to a back staircase, between the lower and the middle seams of coal, and between the upper and the surface. Had the same connexion been continued between the middle and the upper seams, there would have been no tragedy. When, previously to the passing of the first Mining Act, we ventured to press on the legislature the necessity of sinking a second shaft*, our principal object was to secure a better ventilation. The strange combination of untoward circumstances which caused the catastrophe at Hartley could hardly have been foreseen. The single shaft served also for the purpose of pumping, and thus the broken beam of the engine was drawn into it by the pumping rods: the ponderous fragment encountered with irresistible force the ascending cage and killed five of the eight men within; it shattered the brattice, and tore down the lining of the pit, which was unfortunately of wood instead of bricks. The huge splinters intermingling in inextricable confusion, did not fall to the bottom, but stuck in the middle of the shaft; upon them rapidly accumulated quantities of stone and earth dislodged from the sides of the shaft, which in some places was enlarged from twelve to thirty feet. It was the perilous state of the ruined shaft that retarded the workmen so much in their humane labours. They were obliged to secure every yard as they advanced; and even thus they worked in momentary danger of destruction. The fallen earth entirely stopped the circulation of air in the pit. Whether any of the sufferers could have survived till at last the passage was cleared, is uncertain. The foul air gradually accumulated and

* *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xc. p. 545.

perhaps mercifully anticipated the slow work of famine. On the fourth day the 'jowling' which had animated the efforts of their rescuers ceased.

In extensive and fiery mines there has been introduced an ingenious contrivance called 'paneling,' by which the mine is divided into certain quarters, and the currents of air are so managed, that the ill effects of an explosion are confined to the quarter where it took place. Wherever the circumstances of the case make it practicable, this precaution should be taken.

Accidents from falls of the minerals or the roof equal the aggregate of casualties from all other causes whatsoever. Acts of Parliament and colliery regulations insist that props and 'sprags' or diagonal stays shall be abundantly provided to prevent the roof from sinking in, or the mineral which the workmen are undermining from falling upon them. But to dangers of this class the men seem singularly indifferent, in spite of all the pressure that can be put upon them and their own dearly-bought experience. Those who load the coal into trucks are in greater peril than those who hew it; the portion of the roof above their heads, being the furthest from support, is that which is most likely to give way; but it is more convenient to clear away the coal before they apply the props—and thus three-fourths, we are informed, of the accidents of this kind fall to the share of the loaders. 'Not yet' seems to be the delusion which keeps men working on, moment after moment, in situations of peril, till at last they stay one moment too long—and all is over. One day last year a man was engaged in drawing the wood from an abandoned working. He was furnished with a long bar to knock away the props at a safe distance—the roof hitherto had proved sound, and he preferred a short pickaxe. On removing one of the supports an overwhelming rush of 'clunch' or fire clay fell upon him and buried him in an instant. Help came too late. On one occasion the charter-master saw a man working without the usual prop of timber at his back; he remonstrated on the danger of such carelessness, and, bringing a 'tree,' as it is called, fixed it in its proper place. There was something in this proceeding that offended the man's irritable pride. As soon as the charter-master was out of sight he got up in a rage and knocked down the prop, and in a few minutes after was crushed by a fall of rock. In a Shropshire pit, not long ago, an accident occurred which occasioned very general sorrow. Three men, who were working without the usual precautions, were struck down by a mass of earth and stone. Their fellow-workmen rushed up to them, and in the first instance turned to the man

who seemed most to need help. He was lying beneath a huge fragment of rock. 'No,' he said, 'go to those other men first.' They hesitated. 'Go to those other men first, I say; I am "dog-gie" of this pit: you must do as I tell you. Go!' The two men were liberated and ultimately recovered. The lacerated 'doggie' was with difficulty raised to the bank. The surgeon prepared to do what he could, and tied up the femoral artery which was severed, but it was too late. Suddenly a change came over the countenance of the wounded man. 'Let me turn on my face, lads,' he said. The surgeon paused, and raised his hand with a meaning which could not be misunderstood. The noble spirit had fled.

But it is not enough that air, earth, and fire combine against the poor miner; among his worst foes we must reckon water. Not only does the water rise so rapidly in many pits that an accident which stopped the pumps might occasion serious risk, but sometimes in the course of the workings the men come upon some powerful spring or subterraneous reservoir, which bursts upon them with fatal force. To avert this danger it is ordered (and none of the colliery regulations has been better devised) that there shall always be 'bore-holes' of four or five feet in advance of the work, so that if there is water ahead, it may make its presence manifest before the barrier between it and the workmen is weakened to a dangerous degree.*

Many other perils, too, lurk in the mine, and many laws and special regulations have been framed to prevent these 'miscellaneous' accidents as far as they can be foreseen; but rules avail little if they do not meet intelligent obedience, and Acts of Parliament have little terror for lads who defy the charter-master's switch. The boys are expressly forbidden to ride on the 'draughts,' or loaded tram-waggons, which are drawn by horses from the face of the work to the shaft. If they fall off, a severe, perhaps a fatal, accident is the consequence. One sturdy lad, whose comrade had lately been killed by a fall, was told by the charter-master, at the inspector's request, that if ever he caught him at that work again, he would 'strap' him. 'Then thee must strap me, I reckon,' was the cool reply. The young Spartan was turned out of the pit as the only means of saving him from the consequences of his obstinacy, and as a warning to others. But punishments and warnings avail little. At last another accident happens. It is reported that young such-a-one is badly hurt;

* The 'bore-holes' are also indispensable as a precaution when the workmen are in the neighbourhood of old workings whence an irruption of gas may be apprehended.

the old story — nobody's fault but his own ; the father comes up with the big tears washing or rather blotting his begrimed face, and takes a rueful comfort in telling the manager how he has chidden and beaten the boy for the same offence scores of times, — and what is to be done? It is not easy to prevent young gentlemen who are trained, we may presume, to greater docility than the rude collier lad, from sliding down the banisters ; and in all classes of life youth will indulge in pranks in which no enjoyment can be discovered except the zest of disobedience and the excitement of danger.

We might indefinitely prolong the chapter of accidents, but the sample we have given will suffice to show what is the state of things below the surface, and what are the measures taken by the legislature to improve it. Considering the complexity of the subject and the difficulty of framing laws of universal application, as much, probably, has been done, as could have been expected. It is a wise provision that the owners and managers of each district shall meet to frame for their own workpeople a code of special regulations to be approved by the inspector ; and that if the requirements of the inspector are not assented to by the managers, competent umpires shall be appointed to adjust the difference. By this means, something of the required elasticity is given to the law — and that degree of co-operation is secured between those who make the law and those who are bound by it, which is essential to make laws on such matters efficient. After the disaster at the Hartley Pit, an Act was hastily passed to make it imperative to sink a second shaft, — and as each new accident, from whatever cause, is announced in the newspapers, 'Can 'nothing more be done?' is the question impatiently repeated. Pity and vengeance are twin emotions, and it would be a great relief to the benevolent public if matters could be so arranged that for every casualty some one could be convicted of manslaughter. It is common to talk confidently of coercion where coercion is impracticable, and to expect from it, when practicable, more than it can effect. Some of the reports before us imply severe censure on managers for not 'enforcing strict discipline.' But what is the receipt for enforcing strict discipline on workmen, of all others the most self-willed, who, from the state of the labour-market, can set their employers at defiance? The general of an army in the field has special powers ; but a collier cannot be flogged or shot for omitting to place a 'sprag' or light a Davy-lamp ; and, if he could, accidents from neglect would still occur. It is rather to such active zeal

as laws cannot enforce, and to indirect methods of slow but sure efficacy, that we look for what remains to be accomplished for the improvement of the colliery. In a word, it is to the moral and intellectual improvement of the collier, that we must in the first instance turn our attention.

The public are inclined to discredit the recklessness of the men when assigned as the cause of disaster, because in every case of accident attempts are made to prove to the coroner that nobody was in fault but the sufferers themselves; nevertheless it does exist to an extent which it is difficult to exaggerate and mischievous to deny. But it must not be treated as something beyond our control, on the one hand, nor as something wholly remediable by regulations or supervision, on the other. A change must be wrought on the men themselves. But how, and of what nature? Whence, we must inquire, does their disregard of risk arise? not certainly from contempt for danger in the abstract. To danger in prospect, or danger in which they are to remain passive, they are by no means indifferent. Familiar with danger they must always be, but this familiarity ought in reasonable minds to breed systematic caution, and not habitual carelessness. Much, no doubt, must be attributed to the overweening confidence which each man feels in his own luck and his own dexterity, to the desire to save a little trouble, and the many other little motives which influence men in great matters; but the principal cause is the vague incredulity of danger and the inability to reason, and connect cause and effect, which characterise uneducated minds.

The great remedy, then, is the spread of education, education in the larger sense of civilisation: beginning with the young, but extending—as far, as, unconsciously to the recipient, it can be extended—to sturdy, presumptuous manhood, and narrow-minded, obstinate old age.

For the few adults who have the moral courage to put themselves to school, the means of instruction should be provided. But it is also desirable to find less direct and more attractive methods of diffusing knowledge and cultivating habits of reflection. Reading-rooms under proper regulations have been very successful. Lectures are popular; and we would strongly recommend that a lecturer should occasionally be engaged to state in the most popular language, and illustrate by the simplest experiments, a few of the first principles of chemistry and physics, as far as they bear upon the causes of the miner's danger, and the proper measures of precaution.

The ordinary schools in the Midland district are well supported, and well attended. Nevertheless the promoters of edu-

cation were not sorry to have their hands strengthened by the 'education clause,' which forbids the admission of boys to the pits under the age of twelve, unless they can read and write. But this clause had virtually a retrospective effect. What was to become of the uninstructed boys actually at work? and moreover it was marked by the inconsistency which is inevitable so long as the legislature declines to make education compulsory, or to interfere with parental rights; while, nevertheless, it permits the advocates of social improvement, wherever they can make a pretext for intervention, to introduce education clauses, on the plea that they are regulating only the relations between the employer and the employed; but the reasoning which seems conclusive to legislators, who are hurrying away to dinner, is by no means convincing to those who are deprived of their dinner by it. The parents could not be made to understand that their authority was not interfered with, when they were prevented sending their boys to work where they pleased, or that education was not compulsory, when it was made the condition of a boy's earning his bread; 'Will the Government, then, keep the boy and me till he has learnt?' was the unanswerable retort to all remonstrances. On the mine-owner also this clause inflicted much hardship in districts where there is a competition for juvenile labour, and where, consequently, the children were withdrawn from the mines, and sent to trades where ignorance is permitted. One sturdy urchin, on hearing the matter explained, hit the point at once; and, setting his arms a-kimbo, with the most ludicrous assumption of importance and independence, exclaimed, 'I'll go and serve the bricklayers; I will.'

The best way of dealing with a law which could not immediately be executed to the letter, was to carry out its spirit by establishing evening and half-holiday schools to give the boys the necessary instruction, without depriving them of their daily bread. The time during which the law had a retrospective action is fast passing away, but it is to be hoped these schools will be continued for the purpose of improving the very imperfect scholarship of future pit-boys, who, in spite of the law, will often be as easily admitted to work in the pit as a poor, half-taught felon was allowed in the olden time, by a good-natured judge, to prove his claim to the 'benefit of clergy.' We give due credit to the 'Prize Scheme,' as it is called, and other efforts to increase the efficiency of the ordinary schools, but we are satisfied that the best mode of promoting the education of boys in all cases where the temptation is so great to send

them early to work, is to improve to the utmost the teaching of the infant schools.

Many humane writers strongly advocate a change of the peculiar organisation of labour which obtains in the Midland district. In the Northern and some other coal-fields the manager engages each individual workman, and keeps a direct account with him; but in the Midland district the pits are severally taken by contractors, called 'charter-masters' or 'butties,' who covenant to bring the mineral to the surface at a certain price, and engage their own workmen for the purpose. This system no doubt is liable to abuse. The charter-master might keep a provision-shop, and oblige his men to deal with him. He might serve them ill and charge them dear, he might encourage them to run into debt, and thus virtually enslave them. He might even keep a beer-shop, or, in collusion with some publican, might pay his men at a public-house; and there many of them would certainly remain till they had left a great part of their earnings behind them. In fact, all this did occur; and it was also alleged that the charter-masters employed fraudulent weights and measures, and exacted an undue amount of labour.

It was the irritation occasioned by abuses of this kind which, added to the low rate of wages, caused the strike of 1842, the most formidable that has occurred within recent memory. The Staffordshire miners poured into the neighbouring districts, and by persuasion or intimidation induced the workmen to abandon their pits. They organised themselves into formidable bands, and plundered and burnt some houses of importance. The late Lord Dartmouth, who acted as Lord-lieutenant in the absence of his father-in-law, Lord Talbot, put himself at the head of the military and constabulary force then at the disposal of Government. It was very small compared with the numbers of the rioters; but he took his measures with judgment, and executed them with vigour, and suppressed the outbreak with a facility which concealed from the careless public the magnitude of the danger. We have always suspected Aristides was a little tiresome about his love for justice. It could never otherwise have become so obnoxious to the illiterate Athenian, who wanted to ostracise him for it. The most envious Radical in Birmingham could not have taken umbrage at Lord Dartmouth's justice. Nobody in Staffordshire talked about it; but, in the course of this quarrel, the workmen offered to refer their grievances to his sole decision, and to abide by it, so entirely had his clear head and upright heart approved themselves to their untutored minds.

But the responsibility of settling all the details of management

which the matters in dispute involved was such as no individual could undertake. The subject for some time engaged a large share of public attention; and was fully discussed at an important meeting of landholders and iron-masters, when such explanations of the working of the charter-master system were given that the proposal which had been made to abolish it was withdrawn. The abuses complained of have since been put down by Act of Parliament. But laws may be evaded; and Mr. Tremenheere implies that in some districts they are but imperfectly obeyed. Nevertheless, in all well-regulated collieries the laws, backed by the vigilance of owners and managers, are completely efficient; and, to whatever extent these abuses linger, the blame is to be imputed to the heads of the colliery, whose interest, not less than duty, it is to extirpate them utterly.

Mr. Tremenheere gives no weight to the argument that by a direct engagement the men are brought into wholesome contact with their employer. The proper connexion between the two parties must be kept up by means more effectual than the periodical receipt of wages. For the most part, the workman lives in a cottage belonging to the iron-master, and, accordingly, he looks to him for all that the relation of landlord and tenant implies. To him also, or to the various agencies established by him, he looks for help in cases of accident, sickness, or bereavement. If this connexion does not subsist between the workman and his employer, let the employer look to it forthwith; but little will be gained by the workman's receiving wages from a man from whom he receives nothing else.

On the other hand, the charter-master system has many advantages of its own. No knowledge which the owners can acquire of the characters of the men is equal to that of the charter-master. In fact, that knowledge is the great incentive to good conduct throughout the colliery. The charter-masters are a civilising element in their own microcosm; they enforce order, they raise the standard of public opinion, they are the aristocracy of the mine, or rather they occupy the position of the sixth form in a public school. The grade of charter-master is the stepping-stone which holds out to the mere pitman the hope of passing to the rank of manufacturer. If he can save a little money he may take a pit, accumulate capital, extend his speculations; and then there is no limit to the vista of his ambition. Many a man who began life no better than himself has died worth half a million. Take away this intermediate landing-place, and he has little more prospect of advancement than the ploughboy. Mr. Tremenheere quotes instances in which a change to the independent system has worked well, not only morally, but com-

mercially. We do not doubt it, but we can cite cases not less in point to the contrary. In an important work in Staffordshire, the owner, who is always ready to make experiments which have the social welfare of the workmen for their object, introduced the independent system; but, convinced of its failure, he reestablished the charter-masters, and the immediate result was a considerable reduction on the cost of getting both coal and ironstone. The fact is that whether a change from one system to the other is desirable and practicable must be decided by the special circumstances of each particular case. Mr. Tremenhoe's principal argument seems to be that the viewer is unbiassed by interests of his own, whereas the charter-master is often tempted to retrench precautions which cost labour, and to urge on work when work is dangerous. But on the other hand the charter-master has inducements to do his duty which the viewer is without. He knows that he must get his pit a good name, if he would have good men; and if he would get a good day's work out of them, he must give them good air. The truth is that the substitution of a viewer for a charter-master would be beneficial only on the supposition that to a faulty charter-master there succeeds a paragon viewer. But from what class, except that of charter-masters, could the viewers be recruited? and here it is that Mr. Tremenhoe candidly admits his theory breaks down. Till the standard of intelligence and morality throughout the mining population has been greatly raised, he justly considers any sweeping change to be impracticable; and when that great moral improvement has been effected, we do not doubt but that the system best suited to the circumstances and the times will force its own way.

Thus then we are brought back to the point from which all our plans of reform must start. Nor will the officers of a colliery be less benefited than the men by an improved education; and we trust that the mining colleges of which Mr. Tremenhoe gives an interesting account, will receive a fair trial. On the intelligence and capacity of the officials mainly depends the success of the works; yet for the most part their skill is merely empirical, and ignorance is apt to engender in them obstinacy and conceit. A little teaching would make them more efficient and more docile servants. But great caution is needed that instruction is never allowed to supersede the practical experience, which is the one essential qualification. Mr. Tremenhoe ingenuously avows his surprise at the skill and ability with which men of no education fulfil their allotted duties. For the present, however, it is rather with the moral effects of education we are concerned. The officials of a colliery

have, for the most part, risen from the ranks. They have the same habits of thought as the men, and are exposed to the same influences. The underground bailiff especially, though generally an able man of steady character, can scarcely be competent to undertake the sole responsibility of his very important charge. The increased power of directing and controlling his men which he would derive from an improved education would be great, but in the meantime we believe that in most works it would be highly advantageous to employ some man of superior education,—under what name, or with what arrangement of minor details is immaterial,—to superintend the operations underground, though of course in subordination to the general manager. He could not, indeed, be everywhere present, but everywhere his presence might at any time be expected. He should not be above his business, on the contrary, his heart and soul should be in it; but he should be above boosing in pot-houses with the charter-masters. It would be his duty to enforce the regulations, and it should be his pleasure to convince the men of the advantages of compliance. By preventing the wastefulness and malversations which go on underground he would make his services not less remunerative to the owner than beneficial to the workmen. But on the other hand, it is obvious if an unfit man were appointed, he would only serve as a screen to conceal the abuses he is engaged to prevent—and the difficulty of finding the proper man is the practical objection to this advice. But surely the mining colleges might help us in our need. Indeed, we feel much disposed to make this the test of their utility. If they cannot supply this pressing want, what, we may well ask, is the precise good they are supposed to effect? We much approve Mr. Tremenhoe's hint, that those pupils at the college whose means do not enable them to devote their whole time to education, should obtain a certain amount of employment in the neighbouring mines. It would be well that all the students should be encouraged to do so, and we would make their doing so a necessary condition of their obtaining a certificate of fitness for undertaking the situation of which we are speaking.

To the General Manager no knowledge practical or scientific can come amiss—but he also requires much that no schooling can impart. He must possess considerable tact in dealing with the masses, and no small amount of administrative capacity. It is his business to see that every man does his duty; and if he does his own, he is pretty sure to find the hand, or at least the tongue, of every man turned against him. In an iron work much confidence must be reposed in subalterns, who are

not highly paid, and who are much tempted to defraud. No checks that human ingenuity could invent would suffice to prevent the possibility of malversation in some part of the works. The manager must be an Argus of vigilance; but all he can do is to provide that no fraud can be committed without the participation of many. And this is enough, for it is certain that no such concert can be long maintained. The jealousies, the rivalries, the quarrels, the delations of a colliery are infinite. Monarchs and their courtiers have long occupied a pinnacle on which history has turned the full glare of its light, and to which satire has directed all the powers of its magnifying-glass. But a colliery, even the best ordered, might form a rustic counterpart to Versailles. Human nature is the same, whether 'in leather 'or prunella,' in woollen or embroidery. Let us not, as Sydney Smith somewhere says, throw stones at each other's glass-houses, especially when the panes are so very large.

But in order to carry out our plans for the social and moral improvement of the miner, we must make ourselves acquainted with his character, his home, and his occupations above ground. He has qualities which well entitle him to our admiration. The ironworkers and miners of Great Britain have from time immemorial been a hardy, self-reliant race — inured to toil and indifferent to danger. The recklessness which we have noticed with blame is only the caricature of their characteristic virtue. It is difficult for those who are not familiar with mining operations to appreciate the danger and the daring of the men who worked in the Hartley Pit for the rescue of their fellows. And in the recent catastrophe at Barnsley four men, perfectly aware of the risk to which they exposed themselves, deliberately went down the shaft to save the lives of their comrades, and sacrificed their own in the attempt.

The ties of kindred are felt in the Black Country with the force of Highland clanship. It is common for families descended from a common stock severally to assume, in addition to their patronymic and often in lieu of it, some uncouth nickname, by which both the distinction and the connexion between them is marked. On all occasions they cling together, and for right or wrong—more especially the latter—they are ready to stand by each other to the uttermost. The inhabitants of the Black Country have warm feelings, and show great kindness to each other in times of difficulty and distress. In one poor-looking cottage, perhaps, may be found an orphan child, adopted by a kind neighbour, on whom it had no claim but its helplessness; in another a poor woman, whose sick husband is occupying their only bed, and who has been taken in by a kind friend for her

approaching confinement. For the most part they have had little intercourse with their superiors; but their manners are plain rather than rude. They have the substance of true courtesy, if not its external forms. They have a quick sense of kindness. They have not, like the inhabitants of an ornamental village in the neighbourhood of a great mansion, been pampered into unthankfulness: for alas! it needs not the example of Wordsworth's Old Huntsman to prove that the experience of unkindness is the parent of gratitude. They are acutely alive to neglect and injustice. A great many years ago—we are happy to think the incident would not occur now—a worn-out collier applied to a neighbouring landowner for employment. The man was strongly advised to address himself to the iron-master, whom he had served so many years. 'No, sir, 'I shall not go to him,' he doggedly replied; and on being further pressed, he added, 'No, sir, he will give me nothing but the 'boards.' 'The boards! what do you mean by that?' 'Oh! 'sir, it is a saying we have.' 'But what does it mean?' 'Well, 'sir, if a man is killed and carried home on a shutter, Mr. — gives the boards to the widow to help to make a coffin; and 'that is all he ever does.' The man's tone of voice and manner expressed an acuteness of sensibility of which it would be difficult to convey an adequate impression.

We do not deny the existence of the brutalised being who is often set up as the type of the workman in the mines; but we admit it as the exception only, and cannot accept this Caliban as the representative of the hardy, intelligent men with whom our own experience has made us acquainted. When the moral degradation of the miner is inferred from the dirtiness of his habits, we deny both the fact and the inference. His white woollen jacket or blouse, which is in reality all the cleaner for showing its dirt, is frequently washed, and when he gets to his cottage he takes infinite pains to scrub off the grime of the pits. It was on observing this that a proprietor in the Midland district established baths, which were supplied with a perpetual stream of hot water from the blast-engine; but the experiment has not as yet succeeded. Old habit still prevails, and the tub at home is preferred.

Far from supposing himself an object of pity to the agricultural labourer, the miner holds himself to be vastly superior in position and intelligence, or what he calls 'sharpness.' Even when devoid of education, he often possesses no small share of its best results, shrewdness and good sense. Some years ago, on an extensive colliery's changing hands, it was found that three or four hundred cottages had been built on the waste

parts of the estate by the colliers. These houses, in fact, belonged absolutely to the landlord; but it was thought right to propose an equitable adjustment with the occupants on the principle of a building-lease. It might seem difficult to persuade uneducated men to pay rent for houses which they or their progenitors had built, and which they had hitherto enjoyed rent-free. Such an attempt might in Ireland have cost many lives; but here, so strong was the sense of justice, and of the rights of property, that the proposed arrangement was accepted, not only without complaint, but with gratitude.

The rate of wages is high, but is liable to considerable fluctuations; and the miner glories in his power of maintaining it by the combinations and strikes, which form so important a feature in the history of mining; a fatal delusion, which has caused more misery than all the fluctuations of the iron trade. The masters, on their part, act in concert, and hold their meetings for the purpose of regulating wages according to circumstances. The problem, as generally stated, is to fix the portion of the manufacturer's profit, which ought, in fairness, to belong to the workman. But this is a mistake which lies at the root of all misunderstandings between employers and the employed. The price of labour is really regulated by the proportion of the supply to the demand; and the turbulence of the men or the resistance of the masters can be ultimately successful only so far as it is justified by the state of the labour-market. The price of the manufactured article affects the rate of wages only indirectly, by increasing or diminishing the call for hands. We have known instances when, from special causes, there was a scarcity of labour, in a time of depressed trade, and, without any combination among the men, by the mere force of circumstances, the charter-masters were prevented reducing the wages to the standard fixed on by the iron-masters, till the tightness of the labour-market was relieved. Strikes in all trades may be and sometimes are the reaction to oppression, but much more frequently they are mere attempts to establish dictation. The notices are very interesting which Mr. Tremenhoe gives of various strikes, and especially of the repeated attempts of the Northern colliers to obtain complete domination by an extensive union of all the colliers throughout the kingdom, and to dictate the rate of wages and the hours of labour. Fortunately these efforts have been defeated by the firmness of the masters and the different conditions of labour in the various coal-fields, and other difficulties which prevented union. Had they succeeded, we might bid farewell to England's supremacy in the iron trade.

The author of 'A Voice from the Mines' misunderstands the feelings of the black population, when he assumes that their reckless disregard of danger proceeds from indifference to an existence so little worth preserving. On the contrary, their relish for enjoyment is keen; their passion for excitement is strong; and their aversion to self-control they mistake for dignity and independence. A prize-fight, or a poaching adventure, has a charm for them that is irresistible. A wake, a fair, or a race empties the pits of all but the steadiest hands. No bribe would induce these votaries of pleasure to remain. The great difficulty of employers is to induce their men to go regularly to their work, especially when they are most wanted, when the trade is good and wages rise. Every Monday after pay-day is devoted by many to jollity. On such occasions the pit is said to be at 'play;' that is to say, the men who ought to be at work in it are at play; and so entirely is the word 'play' associated with the idea of idleness only, that a poor invalid may sometimes be heard to complain how hard it is to be kept at play for so many weeks, lying on his back, and unable to turn in his bed without help. It is a curious fact that by far the largest part of the deposits at the savings-banks are contributed by the classes who are in receipt of low wages. Self-indulgence increases with the means of gratifying it, and improvidence is the besetting sin of the highly paid workman. Immediately after pay-day many a man will feast on rump-steaks for breakfast, without considering on what he must fast before pay-day comes round again. When wages are high, it is one of the miner's chief triumphs to call at the bar of some large inn for a bottle of port. He rejoices in the glow of the full-bodied, heady liquor which he feels to his fingers' ends; but the chief source of his satisfaction is the consciousness that he walks off with five shillings' worth under his belt, and 'what could my Lord Duke do more?' Cleopatra was not more elated with her potable pearl, or Kitty Fisher with her bank-notes and bread and butter. The quantity of liquor which a seasoned toper can swallow is hardly credible. A charter-master, who was rich enough to be dyspeptic, was advised by the doctor to drink port wine instead of ale. A few days afterwards, he reported himself decidedly better for the prescription, but complained that 'it cost so much.' 'Why, what quantity of wine do you take, man?' asked the doctor. 'Oh, the same as the ale, in course,' was the reply: and how much this actually amounted to, we are afraid to say. Many years ago, a man in a collier's dress, and carrying a small barrel under his arm, entered the kitchen of the Crown and Cushion at Wolverhampton, and asked for a bottle of wine.

He was in that state of moody ferocity which liquor sometimes produces in hard drinkers, instead of simple inebriation. He was very properly refused. 'Oh! you won't,' he retorted; 'very well, it will be all one with us soon.' He threw the barrel on the fire, and its thin sides immediately ignited. The man's manner was strange. The bystanders were startled, but scarcely understood his meaning. The ostler, who had been a collier, saw at once that the barrel must contain gunpowder. He rushed forward, and protecting his hands with his jacket, seized the blazing barrel and dropped it in the only place of safety—the draw-well in the yard. The world has more heroes than it ever hears of, and to be convinced of this we need not go far back in the humble annals of Colliery.

In the Black Country, drunkenness is the direct cause of nine-tenths of all the crimes that are committed. Many a man, who in his sober moments is reasonable, industrious, docile, and kind, is changed by drink into something worse than a wild beast; he quarrels with his equals, insults his superiors, and maltreats his family. Not long ago, an excellent workman at a large ironwork, in a fit of drunken passion, knocked down the furnace-manager, and was of necessity dismissed instantly. A fortnight afterwards he met and accosted the manager at a neighbouring market-town. 'Look here, 'measter,' he said—thrusting both his fists under his waistcoat, and showing the diminution of girth which famine had occasioned—'and I dare na go back to hear the children cry for a bit of 'bread, and I have none to give them.' He received a shilling to provide for instant need, and was told he might return to the works. For long he was put on probation, and appointed to all the hardest and most disagreeable tasks: he bore it with more than cheerfulness, and seemed to take a manly pride in paying the penalty of his past misconduct. Alas! he has since relapsed, and, in spite of all his fine qualities and his desperate struggles for amendment, he is still the reluctant slave of tyrannous habit.

The first object of the reformer is to remove temptations to drink. Where the owners of the colliery have the power, they should prevent the multiplication of beer-shops or ale-houses. The furnace-men, and some others, receive a certain allowance of beer as part of their wages; and it would be very desirable to commute this for a money-payment; but it would be at present impossible to enforce this, and useless, we fear, to allow the option. Nevertheless, the experiment should be made. There is reason to fear that iron-masters would only enlist pride on the side of self-indulgence, if they were prominent in pro-

moting what is called a temperance movement. The masters are such losers by the men's drunkenness, and have so strong an interest in their reformation, that all the efforts they could make for the purpose would be stigmatised as interested and unfeeling. They dare not preach abstinence, and to counsel moderation is unavailing. Would that some practised apostle of temperance would 'haste to the rescue!'

In order to check improvidence, or to counteract its effects, subscriptions to clubs and provident societies, of various kinds, should be encouraged. In a well-arranged colliery a complete system of subscriptions is organised, to meet all the contingencies of sickness or accident, and in addition to this we specially recommend the establishment of penny savings-banks. They are feeders to the ordinary savings-bank. When a contributor's hoard amounts to 20s. he receives 1s. for interest, and the deposit is transferred in his name to the nearest savings-bank. The penny savings-banks are especially designed to attract the young, whose habits are not yet formed. It is the first step in the career of thrift that is so difficult and so important. It is recorded of the late George Stephenson, that he used to say, the greatest feat he ever performed was to save his first guinea.

It is no doubt with the idea that men *must* be amused, that in some collieries the officials encourage, or at least we may presume do not discourage, horse-racing; for we have seen on the walls, in bills six feet long, the 'charter-masters' stakes' advertised. But this is a miscalculation. It is for the purpose of diverting the men from those amusements, which lead to every species of disorder and riot, that Mr. Tremenhoe recommends that all manly games, such as cricket, all humanising and refined tastes, should be encouraged as much as possible. Music is often cultivated with much zeal and some success. We have heard a great deal of the popularity and good effects of singing classes. The advice, that a small plot of garden should be assigned, if possible, to each cottage, is excellent. A passion for gardening under difficulties is very common, and it is touching to see the pride and pleasure with which some self-taught horticultural genius will exhibit the first flowers, or the earliest vegetables of his own growing. We have seen a pigstye converted with infinite ingenuity into a conservatory; and we remember on one occasion to have been offered a picotee carnation by an enthusiast, who after a hard day's work had sat up all the previous night to catch the sound of the first pattering drops of rain, which, on the wind's changing from E.N.E. to S.W., he fondly hoped would come at last to refresh his parched garden.

Of the groups engaged above-ground, the most remarkable are composed of the young women who are at work on the pit-mounds: they take charge of the 'skips,' or baskets of coal and ironstone, when they are landed on the bank. They load the coal in trucks to be carried off to its destination. They separate the ironstone from the shale, which is wheeled off to the extremity of the gradually increasing mound, and they send off the ore to be stacked in large quadrangular heaps, where it is left to undergo, for a while, the cleansing influence of the atmosphere. This is heavy and dirty work, and the pit-girls who are engaged in it, with their shabby dresses tied grotesquely about them, and their inverted bonnets stuck on the top of their heads, seem not less sordid. But before the philanthropist draws his conclusions, let him see them on a Sunday (we wish it were an equivalent phrase to say at church), with clean persons, bright complexions, sparkling eyes, and dressed out in the cheap finery which now-a-days levels all distinctions of costume.

The labour of the pit-mound is severe, and is not regularly undertaken by those who are mothers; but the workwomen have an air of robust health,* and the beauty and number of the children in the cottages prove that the constitution of the mothers has not been injured by over-work in early life. 'Huge women' are they, 'bloused with sun, and wind, and rain, and labour.'* But strange to say, there are to be found among them forms of great refinement and delicacy. In spite of Lord Byron's assertions in prose and verse, very pure patrician blood may circulate through ill-shaped extremities; and we remember once to have seen, accidentally, in the magistrate's office of a mineral district, a pair of hands for which it would be hard to find in London drawing-rooms more than one match. A poor girl was giving her evidence, and as her arms rested negligently on the witness-box, she displayed the taper fingers of a hand which called to mind one of Vandyke's portraits, but in the soft fullness of its outline exhibited rather the faultless symmetry of the antique than the exaggerated attenuation of the Flemish painter's models. She was very young; her demeanour was modest though self-possessed, and more in sorrow than in anger, she turned her large eyes on her lover, whose desertion obliged her to seek justice for her child at the hands of the law. The manner of the boy defendant — for he was not more than twenty — was brutal, swaggering, and senseless. He had no defence to make, and

* Tennyson's 'Princess.'

desired to make none. It seemed that his only object in incurring the expense of resistance was to satisfy himself that he was animated by no spark of love or compunction, justice or mercy, but had yielded only to the coercion of the law.

The pit-girls are not less fond of holidays than their fathers, and much they enjoy two days of saturnalia when, by immemorial custom, the field of labour is turned into a scene of general riot. On Easter Monday, the men roam about the colliery in gangs, and claim the privilege of heaving, as they call it, every female whom they meet,—that is to say, of lifting her up as high as they can, and saluting her in her descent. On Easter Tuesday the ladies have their revenge—and in their hands this strange horse-play acquires redoubled energy. Neither rank nor age are respected; not even the greatest of men, the manager himself, would be secure from attack; and those who will not enter into the fun must purchase exemption by a ransom proportionate to their station.

If the reader desires to see a specimen of the pit-girls, he need not travel to the Black Country for the purpose. In the fruit season they come up in gangs to gather the contents of the suburban wilderness of summer fruits, which are grown for the consumption of voracious London. In the meantime they are much missed by the iron-master at home; but whether, if he could, he would have the cruelty to stop their expedition to the lands of verdure, can never be ascertained. For these fair heroines have a will of their own, and by that will alone they choose to be guided. It is interesting to watch the departure of one of these parties as they troop down to the railway station, attended by their friends, relations, and sweethearts. The tyrant man has the upper hand often enough, to-day it is the ladies' turn. Each errant damsel is accompanied by her swain to carry her bundle and offer her those little attentions which the fair ones of the Black Country can seldom command from the stronger sex. Her eyes sparkle with anticipated pleasure and present triumph, but the air of her attendant is humble and downcast: it is something more than the pain of parting that clouds his brow. Perhaps his coquettish love has hinted she may find a more fitting mate in the south, and who can tell but she may keep her word? Or perhaps she has vowed to do no such thing, but what if she break her word? She would not be the first by a great many, who has been persuaded to do so by a smart policeman or some other great match in the great town. With melancholy and anxious gaze he follows the train as it whirls off. Perhaps some bystander, who himself is heart whole, ventures to joke with the discon-

solate lover, but it is no joking matter. In moody silence he turns away to the nearest alehouse to find solid comfort in 'a glass of something,' and of course not another stroke of work is done that day. At the disembarkation of the party on their return, as the third-class train stops at the station the crowds jostling each other on the platform to greet them create a hubbub such as might be occasioned by a statute-fair or horse-race. Each pit-girl carries on her head a huge bundle tied up in a sheet, like dirty linen for the washerwoman. It is not that she could not afford a trunk, and a handsome one, too, if she so pleased; but the sheet is more elastic, and more portable, and in it she has stowed all the investments which she has made of her earnings in foreign parts, and the commissions which she has executed for some of those who are so anxiously expecting her return.

Pit-mound labour is stigmatised by many well-meaning reformers as not only 'unfeminine,' but also conducive to immorality. But to this we demur. No occupation, indeed, which involves hard work can be considered feminine. Domestic drudgery is feminine only because in England we are accustomed to impose it on women. God forbid that we should advocate the employment of women in any hard work which can be spared them! The revelations of the Commission appointed thirty years ago to inquire into the condition of women employed in the mines may well excite our jealousy on all such subjects, and too much praise cannot be given to the exertions which the Duke of Buccleugh and other proprietors have made to prevent the employment of women in the pits. But the labour on the pit-mound in the open air is not degrading, it does not bring the workwomen into unseemly association with the men, nor does it expose them to the contamination of coarse language. They hear on the pit-mounds exactly the language they would hear at home, and much less of it, for work is not favourable to conversation. Regular occupation, and habits of independence and self-protection, are not unfavourable to the preservation of female virtue among the working classes; and in fact statistical returns prove that the morality of the colliery is quite equal to that of any rural district. Much may be done to improve the condition of the poor pit-girl, but it would be an ill beginning to deprive her of her bread.

Nothing would be more desirable than to give the future mistress of the collier's cottage some instruction in the arts of housewifery. A little knowledge of cookery not only adds very greatly to the comfort of the collier's home, but may

become a source of considerable profit. We once knew a poor widow, who thought herself without resource, but subsequently maintained herself in what she considered opulence, by making tea-cakes which fortunately hit the public taste. Mr. Tremeneere gives an interesting description of an industrial school at Gartscherrie (p. 51.), which has succeeded perfectly. But the only experiment of the kind, which we have seen tried, was to employ the school girls in turn to work in a soup-kitchen which had been established, not as a charity, but as a means of supplying the people with wholesome food: and hitherto it has met with imperfect success. In one instance, evening meetings of the pit-girls have been set on foot by kind ladies who attend to teach them to sew and cut out, and also to read to them, and instruct them, while they are at their work. The professed object of the meeting is to make clothes of various kinds which may be purchased by the pit-girls themselves, or others of the workpeople, at cost price. This attempt has met with a more complete and more rapid success than usually attends measures of colliery reform.

Many of the cottages, in spite of the blacks outside, are bright and clean, and do great credit to the housewife within. In many instances they are sadly overcrowded, and this is an evil which it is by no means easy to obviate, even in an agricultural neighbourhood. But no money can be better laid out than that which is spent in improving the sanitary condition and the comfort of the workmen's dwellings, and in building lodging-houses such as Mr. Tremeneere describes for single men (p. 51.). In cases of sickness or accident the want of fitting accommodation is especially distressing. It would be very desirable to set apart some larger and better-built house as a hospital for the reception of sufferers from accidents who require quiet, or who cannot be properly attended in their own homes. Collieries which adjoin each other might easily unite to establish for the common benefit a hospital for accidents, provided with all necessary appliances. For the want of such an establishment a very valuable life was lost not long ago. A man of excellent character had been wounded by the premature explosion of a 'shot' in the mine, and was suffering from concussion of the brain, but the surgeon had reported him out of danger, when an idle scapegrace fired a gun close to his cottage, and the shot rattled against the lattice. The sick man started up in bed; the sound recalled his accident and all its horrors to his memory with a severe shock, and from that moment he declined.

There has of late years been a great increase of churches and

of pastoral supervision in the mineral districts. But much still remains to be done. For the most part the districts where minerals were first raised were thinly peopled, and churches were few. A large population was rapidly collected, but no provision for their spiritual wants was made. The Dissenters, more especially the Methodists, in the first fervour of their early zeal, rushed in to take possession of the vacant ground. Of late years churches have been built and districts allotted; but it is easier to build churches than to fill them. In many cases it is only a small minority, including, however, for the most part the aristocracy of the colliery, that form the congregation of the church. The attendants at the different chapels are a more numerous body. The familiar address of the preachers, the coarse but intelligible language, and the flattering doctrines, make their pulpits attractive. The organisation of the dissenting bodies enlists vanity in their support by imparting a share of authority to many, and by trusting the charge of teaching others to those who have never learned themselves. But between the churchmen and the schismatics there is a class more numerous than either, who think that whether they go to church or chapel is as much a matter of indifference as whether they get their beer at the Crown or the Chequers; and many of these maintain a neutrality so strict between the two, that they rarely go to either. There is a fourth party, which, unfortunately, is a very numerous one, who openly scoff at both, and are determined to get through this work-a-day world with as little restraint as they can help, and as much enjoyment after their own fashion as they can snatch. Such, for the most part, is the population which the underpaid incumbent of a large parish is called on to deal with. Poor, unfriended, unaided, burdened with children, oppressed with the sight of misery he cannot relieve and vice he cannot reform, it is much if he does not sink into the apathy of despair. It is very satisfactory to learn that considerable efforts are making in the Midland district for the increase of poor endowments; but no augmentation that can be hoped for will enable a rector of this class to pay for the help he needs; and therefore to supply him with active curates, and, if the circumstances render it desirable, with Scripture-readers also, is the first of duties. In fact, it is necessary to organise a missionary agency. But to our apprehension it would be a great error to undertake a crusade against dissent. The first enemy to be combated is open infidelity; moreover, it is easier to win over dissent by ignoring it than to conquer by opposing it. And though schism is so rife in the

Black Country, it is happily unaccompanied with bitterness against the Church. The announcement of a popular preacher, or the advent of the bishop on some special occasion, will bring the dissenters, class-leaders and all, to church. The incumbent has no theological rancour to encounter, unless by some imprudence he provokes it. But he will not find it easy to establish the necessity of 'good works.' We may sometimes see among the dissenters, more especially among the women, instances of the most touching piety; but, on the other hand, there is often the strangest incongruity between language and conduct. Antinomianism is a hard word; but somehow or other the Dissenters have found means to reconcile very high spiritual pretensions with a low standard of practice. We call no witnesses, we appeal only to one notorious fact. * If their practice bore any proportion to their professions, most certainly in the country towns, where their strength mainly lies, they would engross the whole retail trade; but they do no such thing, and the conclusion is irresistible. The minister who preaches reformation will often find it easier to impress the hardened veteran of sin than the conceited self-deceiver, who has deadened his conscience with the opiates of false theology. If you remonstrate with him on his conduct, he replies you are ignorant of the glorious liberty of the Gospel; and if you try to point out his error, he retorts that you are still in the gall of bitterness and threatens to pray for you at his next class-meeting.

The observance of Sunday is much what might be expected among a population thus divided. To many it is a day of rest and nothing more. The toil of the week makes mere physical repose an enjoyment. To many it is a day of household cares. The Marthas of the mines are 'cumbered with much serving,' and rarely attend morning church. The author of 'A Voice from the Mines' bursts into a passionate exclamation against 'Sunday cooking.' But if there is Sunday dining there must be Sunday cooking. No doubt the establishment of the public bakehouses which he recommends would tend to mitigate the evil. But no sudden effect could be expected from a remedy which would remove only one of the housewife's many pretexts for staying at home. Another suggestion, by the same author, the change of the pay-day from Saturday to Friday, must be judged according to the special circumstances of each individual case. In some instances, we are persuaded the innovation would only have the effect of adding another day of debauchery to the licentious holidays of the week, and Sunday, thrust in between two days of drunkenness, would have less chance of being duly hallowed than ever. To some, and those not a few, Sunday is

a day of riot and debauchery. In many cottages a suspicious-looking dog, who slinks away on meeting a stranger's eye, as if conscious of his guilty complicity, sufficiently indicates the nature of the morning's amusement. If no other excitement offers itself, drinking and gambling fill up the day; but, if the weather is fine, pigeon-flying is the favourite diversion. This sport is pursued in various ways: sometimes the bet turns on which of a rival pair of 'tumbler's' makes the greatest number of summersets in the air; sometimes it is a race between two pigeons, turned out to fly to their usual feeding-place; or several are let loose at once, and the owner of the bird which first arrives at a designated spot pockets the stakes. Their flight is followed by their owners and a rabble rout on foot. Disputes and quarrels ensue, and all is riot and disorder. The keeping of pigeons is discouraged as much as possible, and pigeon-flying is prohibited; but in vain.

The iron-master, however, has no right to complain that Sunday is a day of mere animal rest or of brutal excitement, if he has not done all in his power to prevent its being a day of labour. No work, indeed, is done except at the furnaces; but the exception is a large one. In the debates on the observance of Sunday some years ago, it is said that a zealous Sabbatarian proposed that the furnaces should be extinguished on Saturday night and lighted on Monday morning. Fortunately, there was some member present who could inform the House that this double operation of 'blowing out' and 'blowing in' would take nearly a fortnight; but it is very possible to discontinue the blast, and to keep the furnaces in a quiescent state for eight or ten hours, so as to allow the many persons who are employed about them to make themselves comfortable and attend a place of worship. This change it is a duty to make. But we cannot venture to promise the immediate and full success which was reported to Mr. Tremenhære, who was assured that since the adoption of this simple expedient a colliery which he names has presented the orderly and devotional aspect of a rural parish.

But when the legislature and the employers of labour have done their best, the observance of Sunday can only be protected; it cannot be enforced. To attempt more than protection is a waste of time and a misapplication of power. The non-observance of Sunday is the surest symptom of a low state of religious feeling; but it is vain to combat the symptoms and leave the seat of the disease untouched. The scarlet fever cannot be cured by powdering the skin with white flour. When by adequate missionary exertion the population of our large

towns and manufacturing districts are thoroughly christianised, they will know how to keep and to enjoy the Christian's day of rest, but not till then.

The miner is more fortunate than many other classes of operatives, inasmuch as he is less affected by the vicissitudes of trade. The fluctuations of the iron-market are notorious; but the pressure, in the first instance, falls on his employers. If the depression is long continued, wages fall; but the workman can live, and the iron-master has not the power of dismissing his hands to any great extent. It is not safe to let his men disperse: it is ruinous to let his pits fall in. He is obliged to hold out to the last moment. If, in spite of all his efforts and all the help he can obtain, he sinks at last, then, indeed, the distress is fearful to contemplate. The cottages deserted by their starving inhabitants, who roam about, seeking work and finding none, or throng the thoroughfares of the neighbouring towns in listless groups—the furnaces cold, the engines silent, and all that used to speak of life and bustle standing motionless and meaningless;—all this presents an image of desolation and despair which can only be surpassed by the real wretchedness of which it is the outward sign. The last five years of depression in the iron trade have presented not a few examples of such like scenes. But they are separated from each other by distance of time and space, and do not present such an aggregate of misery as to attract public notice and sympathy.

The suggestions which we have thrown out for the gradual improvement of the mining population pretend to no novelty. On the contrary, it is rather their merit they have been much discussed, and to a certain extent subjected to the test of experience; and most of them are backed, we are happy to find, by the recommendation of the inspectors. The writers of charitable appeals often seem to have confined their attention so exclusively to one special object that they see no other, and expect society to turn itself into a missionary agency for the correction of their favourite grievance, and for the performance of some duty which those to whom it belongs choose to neglect. We quite agree that the opulent classes who live in the midst of a mining population may be of the greatest use to their black neighbours. But the duty of caring for the workmen and their families belongs chiefly, and in the first instance, to those who benefit by their labour, the coal-owners and iron-masters. This duty is acknowledged and performed by some—we hope by many. Those who neglect it, we cite before the bar of public opinion. But a few cautions are necessary: the reformer must not be discouraged if he does not meet the speedy

and full success which the narratives of benevolent writers, and even the reports of commissioners, might lead him to expect. We cannot undertake to tell him why this is—it may be that only the most eminently successful cases are reported. It may be that the efforts of his predecessors have been better directed; and, if so, he must make up for want of skill by perseverance. Charity, too, it must be remembered, in the sense of almsgiving, is an especially delicate task in the colliery. A very small sum annually laid out in misdirected alms, would destroy half the virtue of the place. Numbers who, with laudable self-devotion, support their aged and infirm kinsfolk, would throw down the burden, if by doing so they could induce a stranger to take it up: many who are struggling courageously with difficulties would cease their efforts if they could find other support to rely on. The rule which should guide all our charitable attempts is, to assist and direct, but not to supersede, individual effort: in a word, to help those who will help themselves.

Yet difficult as is the task of doing good, there is none that is so lightly undertaken. It seems to be generally assumed that, where the intentions are good, the judgment cannot be wrong. Reform is easy work when we look only at the shadowed side of things as they are, and the bright side of the proposed remedies. But few are the conditions which are not relieved by some intermixture of good, and fewer still the reforms which are wholly unattended by mischief, or at least by danger. Philanthropy is impatient, but the Gordian knot of social evil must be carefully untied, thong by thong; it can rarely be cut by a single effort. The great moral which is learnt by practical and personal efforts to improve the social condition of the workman is patience and perseverance: patience to inquire into facts, to investigate causes, and to bear disappointment; perseverance to toil on, to plan afresh, and to wait for the aid of the most powerful of all auxiliaries—Time.

ART. VI.—*Papers relative to the Mutinies in the East Indies, and Appendices: Sessions 1857–1858.*

‘ALL IS WELL IN OUDE;’—such was the announcement, just received by telegraph from Lucknow, which Lord Dalhousie placed in Lord Canning’s hands, as the first and the best greeting he could receive on landing.

In announcing this, Lord Dalhousie felt that he was announcing the consummation of a policy which was even more Lord Canning’s than his own. Of all his predecessors in the great office which he was then assuming, Lord Canning alone had shared in the responsibility of the Government of India before he touched its shores. He had been member of the Cabinet to whose final decision the question of Oude had been specially referred. That Cabinet had not only decided on the general course to be pursued, but in respect to the measures required for carrying their policy into effect, they had announced through the Court of Directors that they were prepared to cover with their own responsibility the doubts and scruples which had embarrassed Lord Dalhousie. Care had been taken that this should be understood by the King of Oude. The Resident expressly told him that ‘the assumption of the Government of Oude had been directed by the Court of Directors, with the unanimous consent of Her Majesty’s Ministers, of whom the future Governor-General was one; and that Lord Dalhousie had been directed to carry this policy into execution, prior to his departure from India.’* Little more than two months had elapsed since the orders of the Court had been received. Those orders were delivered to Lord Dalhousie at midnight, on the 2nd of January, 1856; and the termination of his rule had been fixed for the 1st of March. This was short time for the execution of measures of such importance. By the end of the month the troops of the Company had crossed the Ganges; and on the 7th of February Outram had formally assumed the Government of the country, in the name of the Supreme Government of India.

Lord Canning, therefore, when, in March 1856, he assumed the Government of India, assumed also the Government of Oude. The work of taking military possession of the country was a work

* Oude Papers, p. 283.; Letter from Major-General Outram to the King, Feb. 1, 1856.

which he found completed. And there was another task more difficult and more important, which he found completed also. The last weeks of Lord Dalhousie's laborious life in India, had been devoted to organising the Government of the new Province, choosing the men who were to conduct it, and laying down the principles on which its people were to be ruled. Lord Canning continued to administer the system which he thus found established. Like so much else which Lord Dalhousie did, the instructions issued for the Government of Oude have generally been spoken of in terms betraying entire ignorance of what these instructions were. Oude was to be ruled as nearly as possible as the Punjaub had been ruled. Scrupulous respect for all existing rights, whatever those rights might on inquiry be found to be; protection to the cultivator of the soil from farmers of the revenue who had been the curse of Oude; assessments light, and as equal as they could be made; a rapid administration of justice unencumbered with dilatory and expensive forms—these were the leading principles which Outram was to observe in the first summary settlement of the province. The essential idea of these instructions was, that our dealings with the people of Oude were to be founded on their own ancient customs. 'It was Lord Dalhousie's object 'to improve and consolidate the popular institutions of the country, by maintaining the village Coparcenaries, and adapting our proceedings to the predilections of the people and the local laws to which they were accustomed.' Nor is it true, as has been often said, that any violent course was contemplated in respect to those who were called 'Talookdars' in Oude. The rapine habitually exercised by this class, had been among the most desperate oppressions of the people. The reports of Sleeman, of Outram, and of Lawrence describe in terrible detail the miseries they had inflicted. But though Lord Dalhousie desired that this class should be thoroughly restrained, and that the Government should deal directly with the village Zemindars, or with the Proprietary Coparcenaries wherever these were found to exist, he intimated at the same time that the claims of the Talookdars, or of others who had exercised power under the former system, 'should be brought judicially before the Courts competent to investigate and decide upon them.*' Outram was further directed to confirm and maintain all genuine grants of rent-free lands given by the former Government.

Such was the nature of the system for the Government of

* Oude Papers, p. 260.

Oude, which in course of being rapidly carried into effect, Lord Dalhousie handed over to Lord Canning. 'All was well 'in Oude'—and all continued to be well for the whole of the first year of Lord Canning's rule; no change was made; nor was there any reason to suppose that change was needed. Discontent, of course, there must have been—deep discontent among the predatory chiefs who were now for the first time restrained under a just and powerful Government. But the Talookdars of Oude were as helpless under Outram, as had been the Sirdars of the Punjaub under Lawrence. There was every ground for the hope and the belief that a system of government which was no experiment, but one which had been well tried elsewhere with the happiest results, would in a few more years 'become the instrument of restoring to affluence 'and prosperity one of the most fertile regions of the globe.'*

Within six months of Lord Canning's arrival his Government was called upon, out of its superabundant strength, to support the policy of England beyond the frontiers of India. An expeditionary force was sent to Persia, commanded by the gallant Outram. We shall not discuss here the policy of the Persian war, nor relate the incidents of its short and successful course. One historical interest, however, attaches to the Persian expedition of 1856. It was the last of its kind. Parliament was jealous of a war conducted by troops over which it had no regular control in the matter of finance; and this expedition led to the adoption of a clause in the Act 21 & 22 Vict. c. 106., by which it is now unlawful to apply the revenues of India in support of any military operation beyond the frontiers of India, unless with the consent of both Houses of Parliament.

All the signs of peace in which Lord Canning's Government began, continued to surround his course during the whole of the year 1856. There was no danger apparent, and for the best of all reasons,—there was no danger present, except such dangers as, in India, are present always. It is very difficult to make men believe, when a great calamity has occurred, that it has arisen from causes with which they have been long familiar, but of which they have taken little notice. Such causes, though, perhaps, of tremendous power, always seem small causes, and inadequate to the effect. On the other hand, they readily attribute such calamity to any transaction or event, however weak or inefficient, which has attracted their attention much and recently. Everything, at such times, is seen out of its true perspective, and much that is said, accordingly, is

* Lord Dalhousie's Instructions. (*Oude Papers*, p. 260.)

the mere utterance of bewilderment, resentment, or alarm. To this class of delusion must be ascribed the vague confused idea, that the mutiny of the army of Bengal was in some way due to the annexation of Oude. It is perfectly true that there was an extensive connexion between the Sepoy regiments and the population of that country. A majority of the men in every regiment of the army of Bengal were recruited in Oude, and their families resided there. But if this circumstance gave to the Sepoys any very warm affection for the Native Government, or any warm interest in its stability, they must have been a singular exception to all other classes of their countrymen. The theory requires that they should have considered it a privilege to be under the rule of the King of Oude, and a misfortune to be brought under the rule of the Governor-General of India. But the fact, as might be expected, was precisely the reverse. It was the special privilege of the Oude Sepoy that he and his family, from the moment of his enlistment, was able to claim, and did habitually claim, the protection of the British Government, through its Resident at Lucknow. If, therefore, the Oude Sepoy rebelled because Oude was annexed, he rebelled, not because he thereby lost any privilege himself, but because a privilege, which he very highly valued, was extended to all his countrymen. Human nature is very bad, but it is not quite so perverse as this; and the truth is, that unlikely and unnatural as such a motive would be, even this motive did not really exist. The Oude Sepoy, though entitled to British protection, was not always able to obtain it. His family was living in a country which was a prey to oppressions without limit and without number; and, though he was perpetually appealing to the Resident for protection or redress, the Resident was unable to secure it for one out of a hundred of the complaints to which he had to listen; consequently, the Sepoy had a direct interest, second only to that of his less privileged neighbours, in coming effectually under the government which was already, in theory, his own. Practically he was still subject to the evils suffered by the community to which his family belonged. Consequently, it is not surprising to find that Colonel Sleeman, in a letter to one of the Directors in 1852, specially referred to the interests and wishes of the Sepoys as an additional reason in favour of our possessing ourselves of the Government of Oude. He says:—

‘We have at least 40,000 men from Oude in the armies of the three Presidencies, *all now, rightly or wrongly, cursing the oppressive government under which their families live at their homes.* These families would come under our rule, and spread our good

name as widely as they now spread the bad one of their present ruler. Soldiers with a higher sense of military honour, and duty to their salt, do not exist, I believe, in any country. To have them bound to us by closer ties than they are at present, would, of itself, be an important benefit.' (*Sleeman's Journey through Oude*, vol. ii. p. 379.)

But, if it is a delusion to suppose that the interest of the Oude Sepoy lay in preserving the Native Government, it is, if possible, a still greater delusion to suppose that any feeling of religion or of race can have tended in that direction. The people of Oude is, in large proportion, a Hindoo people, and our Sepoys derived from it were in large proportion Sepoys of the Hindoo faith. They were notoriously not only Hindoos, but generally men of the highest castes, and bigoted beyond others in their religion. The reigning family of Oude was a Mahomedan family. It represented a government which was odious in itself; and it represented, besides, a race and a faith from which the natives of Hindostan had suffered conquest and immemorial oppression.

The notion that the army of Bengal must have been affected by opinions on the Oude question, which were the opinions of a small section of Anglo-Indian politicians, stands in curious contrast with the notion that the Sepoy regiments cannot have been really affected to any serious extent by a trivial incident affecting the prejudices of caste. This estimate of the relative importance of the two matters is very natural from our European point of view. It is an optical deception. The annexation of Oude was a very recent event, and a very important one in the history of Anglo-Indian politics. The difficulties connected with it had held successive governors-general at bay. At the last moment it had divided the members of the supreme Government of India. A decision so important in the minds of English statesmen must, it is assumed, have equally attracted the attention, and must have equally affected the mind, of native soldiers. On the other hand, caste is a superstition with which we have long been familiar. We had respected it, acknowledged it, almost shared in it. How could any new effect arise from so old and so well-known a cause? It is true, indeed, that the institution of caste had been long familiar to us. But it is hard for any European to measure or understand the nature of its power. If we would see in operation the tremendous force which produced the great mutiny of 1857, we must look, not to any political measure, however recent or notorious, but to old familiar incidents in the story of our rule in India. Col. Skinner, founder of the

famous Irregular Force called 'Skinner's Horse,' gives us the following account of what happened to himself on the 31st January, 1800, when left wounded on the field after an engagement with the Rajah of Oonera:—

'It was about three in the afternoon when I fell, and I did not regain my senses till sunrise next morning. When I came to myself, I soon remembered what had happened, for several other wounded soldiers were lying near me. My pantaloons were the only rag that had been left me, and I crawled under a bush to shelter myself from the sun. Two more of my battalion crept near me—the one a Soobahdar that had his leg shot off below the knee; the other, a Zemadar, had a spear wound through his body. We were now dying of thirst, but not a soul was to be seen, and in this state we remained the whole day, praying for death. But, alas! night came on, but neither death nor assistance. The moon was full and clear, and about midnight it was very cold. So dreadful did this night appear to me that I swore, if I survived to have nothing more to do with soldiering—the wounded on all sides crying out for water—the jackals tearing the dead, and coming nearer and nearer to see if we were ready for them: we only kept them off by throwing stones and making noises. Thus passed this long and terrible night. Next morning we spied a man and an old woman, who came to us with a basket and a pot of water; and to every wounded man she gave a piece of bread from the basket and a drink from her water-pot. To us she gave the same, and I thanked heaven and her. But the Soobahdar was a high caste Rajpoot; and as this woman was a "Chumar" (or of the lowest caste), he would receive neither bread nor water from her. I tried to persuade him to take it, that he might live; but he said that in our state, with but a few more hours to linger, what was a little more or a little less suffering to us? Why should he give up his faith for such an object? No, he preferred to die unpolluted.*

The strength which, against the cravings of failing nature, could resist the double tortures of such temptation must have been strong indeed. The value which a man places in his honour, or a woman in her virtue, or the proudest in his special source of pride;—the pride of race, the pride of theology, the pride of birth;—the tenacity with which the most saintly Christian clings to a true faith and a holy life,—all are concentrated and caricatured in the passion with which a Brahmin guards from pollution the purity of his caste. And yet that pollution may come to him by no conscious act of his own—by accident—or by the design of another. In a moment he may be degraded, defiled, disgraced,—driven from amongst his kindred, and lost in the world to come. When such a fear takes possession of the mind, it becomes a prey to incurable suspicions. Contact

* Military Memoir of Lieut.-Colonel James Skinner, vol. i. p. 178.

with other minds under similar impressions increases tenfold the tendency to panic. Explanations and assurances which would allay the fears of one, are repelled by the ignorance or ill temper of another. Suspicion becomes terror, and terror becomes hatred, until at last a body of men, under the sway of such passions, is capable of any folly and of any crime.

This is the power which some writers and speakers in this country have regarded as trivial; and which their ignorance of native character has led them to set aside as less capable of explaining the mutiny of the Bengal army than plots or conspiracies of which there is no trace whatever, and which, if they had existed, could never have accounted for the curious and terrible phenomena of 1857.

In the month of December 1856, or early in January 1857, a workman, or 'classie,' of low caste, in the arsenal at Dum-Dum, near Calcutta, where the school for musketry practice with the new Enfield rifle was then established, asked a Brahmin Sepoy for a drink of water from his lotah or water-vessel. The Sepoy refused, saying, 'You will defile my lotah by your touch.' The classie answered, 'You think much of your caste! Wait a little; the Sahib-logue will make you bite cartridges soaked in cow and pork fat! and where will your caste be then?' These words went home. They were repeated by the Brahmin to his comrades — they flew from mouth to mouth, with corroborations invented and believed. In a few days they had spread among all the native regiments in the stations near Calcutta, and were the common topic of whisperings by day and consultations in Brahmin huts by night. It was not till the 21st of January 1857 that this alarm attracted the serious attention of any European officer. On the evening of that day, some of the Sepoys, in conversing with Lieutenant Wright, of the Rifle dépôt, told him that the report had already spread through India, and they feared that when they went to their homes their friends would refuse to eat with them. The men seemed to be ashamed to confess the hold which this fear had taken of their own mind, and each Sepoy very generally disclaiming it for himself, appealed to its prevalence among his kindred or his caste. But though suspicion had begun to work, it had not shaken their confidence in their officers. The men spoke freely of it, and recommended as a remedy, that they should be allowed to buy for themselves in the bazaars the ingredients for cartridge grease. On the 22nd of January, Lieutenant Wright reported this to the adjutant of the dépôt, and supported the recommendation of the men. On the following day, this report and recommendation reached Major-

General Hearsey, commanding the Presidency Division at Barrackpore, and was immediately forwarded with his support to the Deputy Adjutant-General of the army at Calcutta. General Hearsey's letter was dated on the 23rd, but it did not reach the Supreme Government till the 26th. Lord Canning did not lose a day. On the 27th the Governor-General in Council not only approved General Hearsey's recommendation, but issued special orders to the Inspector-General of Ordnance that with the 'least possible delay, he was to submit any suggestions for removing the objections raised by the Sepoys,'—that 'means must be taken to satisfy them that nothing which 'may interfere with their caste was used'—and that in the meantime the cartridges were to be issued without any grease at all. On the same day, orders to the same effect were sent by telegraph to the most distant stations in India—where alone similar schools of instruction in rifle practice had been established—to Meerut, Umballah, and Sealkote.*

In the meantime signs of agitation had appeared in all the regiments stationed at Barrackpore. On the 26th, these corps were paraded by their colonels, and mutual assurances were exchanged between those officers and their men. On the morning of the 28th, the order of the Government, allowing the Sepoys to choose for themselves the grease required for their ammunition, was made known to every regiment in the cantonment. A very curious change now took place in the object of suspicion—showing the morbid and irrational state into which the men's minds were thrown. Satisfied and silenced on the composition of the grease, they transferred their suspicion and alarm to the composition of the new cartridge-paper. General Hearsey met this new phase of the prevailing mania with persevering temper and patience. Full explanations were addressed to the men as to the composition of the paper. A court of inquiry was appointed, on the 4th of February, and the evidence of the highest caste native officers and men was taken. That evidence was given freely, and in a respectful spirit. It is sad to read it. No glimmer of human reason can be traced. It is very much the sort of evidence that we may suppose might

* Append. to Papers relative to the Mutinies. Inclosure 10 and 11 in No. I., p. 3. We give our reference for this statement, as Lord Derby, in his speech of Dec. 3, 1857, subsequently published by authority, said:—'Throughout the whole of this period, from the beginning of February to the 20th March, no single step, as far as I can find, was taken on the part of the Government, either to disabuse the minds of the Sepoys on the subject of these greased cartridges, or to ascertain their probable intentions,' &c.

be given by a shying horse, if he could speak, on the cause of his irrational alarms. The poor bewildered Sepoys had been testing and examining the paper by tearing it, by wetting it, by smelling it, by burning it. One of them, Chaud Khan by name, told the Court that, 'on the evening of the 4th, a piece of the cartridge paper was dipped in water, and then burnt. When burning, it *made a phizzing noise* and 'smelt as if there was grease in it!' General Hearsey, intimately acquainted with native character, saw at once the strength and reality of the panic, and reported on the 7th of February, to the Deputy Adjutant-General at Calcutta, that 'this foolish idea is now so rooted in the Sepoys, that it would, in his opinion, be both idle and unwise even to attempt its removal.' It is very difficult, however, to make up one's mind that men are absolutely inaccessible to reason, and are reduced by abject superstition beneath the level of the beasts that perish. Lord Canning was quite willing to dispense with the new paper, if the old would do. But it was too thick for the new bore and new ammunition, so this expedient failed. He then immediately ordered a scientific examination of the Enfield cartridge paper, to satisfy, if possible, the Sepoy mind in respect to the composition. It was found, of course, that the paper was entirely free from grease. It was no otherwise peculiar than that it was very thin, light and strong, and was somewhat glazed from the use of size.

Meanwhile, new and more serious symptoms were appearing. Bad feeling was evidenced by incendiary fires among the military huts of the cantonment. This is a mode of testifying discontent which was not new in the Indian army. It is not the work of conspirators anxious to conceal some deep design, but of discontented men ashamed or afraid of expressing their discontent in more articulate form. It is a warning, and warnings are not generally given by those who plot. General Hearsey was indefatigable in his endeavours both to re-establish discipline and to conciliate and satisfy the men. On the 9th he paraded the whole brigade stationed at Barrackpore, and addressed the men in their own language. He explained to them the glazed appearance of the paper, and the necessity for its new and peculiar quality. He explained the folly of supposing that the Government had any wish to break down their caste; and the still greater absurdity that it contemplated forcing them to embrace Christianity. He endeavoured to explain what Europeans understood by conversion, — how it depended on persuasion of the mind, and was incapable of being effected by violence or trickery of any kind. Finally, in a loud voice he asked the

men if they understood all he had said. They nodded assent.* Again, as before, the agitation subsided for a time, and the men and the native officers were reported as quite relieved and happy.

So far the careful and conciliatory conduct of General Hearsey and of Lord Canning had met with its reward. And so matters remained till the 26th of February; when at the neighbouring station of Berhampore, the officer in command of the 19th Native Infantry, having ordered a parade for exercise on the following morning, was astonished by the men refusing to receive the copper caps, which it was the custom in that corps to issue on the previous night. This officer, Colonel Mitchell, had already explained to his regiment all that had been said to their comrades at Barrackpore, and the ammunition which was about to be served out for practice was not the new ammunition at all, but cartridges on the old pattern, left by the last native regiment which had occupied the station. He was naturally astonished at the objections of the men — assembled the native officers, and warned them to tell their companies that continued disobedience would be severely punished. However natural this language was, it differed essentially from the tone which had been taken with similar fears by General Hearsey. Between ten and eleven at night, Colonel Mitchell was roused by the sound of drums and shouts from the Sepoy lines. On hastening out he met a native officer, who told him that the men had broken open the ‘bells of arms,’ and had loaded their muskets. Colonel Mitchell sent instant orders to bring up some cavalry and artillery. On their arrival, he marched down to the parade ground and found the men armed and formed in line. Some of them shouted out to the European officers, ‘Do not come on, the men will fire.’ The native officers now surrounded the Colonel, begging him not to be violent with the men. Colonel Mitchell then addressed the men in angry language, in which threats of being sent to Burmah, or somewhere beyond sea, were mingled with imperative orders to lay down their arms. The native officers told the Colonel, that so long as the guns and cavalry were present they could not prevail on the men to lay down their arms, but if these were withdrawn, the men, who were in a panic of being attacked, would at once return to their duty. Colonel Mitchell, at first too violent, was now not firm enough. He

* It marks Lord Canning’s watchfulness and anxiety at this early period, that some delay in reporting to him the result of this address to the men was animadverted on as ‘most reprehensible.’ Inclos. 16 in No. 3. Append. to Papers.

withdrew the cavalry and artillery. The men laid down their muskets, retired to their huts, and in the morning responded to the bugle calling to parade as if nothing had occurred.

Such was the first act in the Great Indian Mutiny—the first occasion in which the native soldier was hurried into any act of open insubordination—the first, too, in which an English officer had not dealt towards the Sepoy with perfect temper. It is due to Colonel Mitchell to record that he immediately forwarded to General Hearsey, without a word of comment, a petition from his men, stating their case, with some exaggeration, against himself. It is impossible to read this document, or the evidence taken before the Court of Inquiry which followed, without being impressed with the obvious sincerity of the men, and of the uncontrollable terrors and suspicions which had taken possession of their minds. Their Colonel's angry words, and imperative orders to use the cartridges on the following morning, had confirmed their suspicions. 'He gave this order so angrily, that we were convinced the cartridges were greased, otherwise he would not have spoken so.' The words following describe with simple force all the invariable features of panic among a multitude of men. 'Shouts of various kinds were heard—some said there was a fire; others, that they were surrounded by Europeans; some said that the guns had arrived, others that the cavalry had appeared. In the midst of this row the alarm sounded on a drum, then, from fear of their lives, the greater number seized their arms.' The men then narrate how they had since been allowed to inspect the cartridges, and how the different kinds of paper still gave rise to suspicions; they conclude thus:—

'From that time onwards all duties have been properly carried on; and so shall be. As long as we live we will faithfully obey all orders; wherever in the field of battle we are ordered to go, there shall we be found; therefore, since this is a religious question, from which arose our dread, and as religion is by the order of God the first thing, we petition that as we have done formerly, we may be now also allowed to make up our own cartridges, and we will obey whatever orders may be given to us.'

But Lord Canning saw that the great offence committed by the corps, in having had recourse to arms to resist the orders of their Colonel, and in having been prepared to fire on their officers if they had advanced, was an offence which it was impossible to condone. Accordingly, though delaying any formal decision until the Court of Inquiry had established all the facts, Lord Canning, on the 6th of March, sent to Rangoon for a

European regiment of Foot, the 84th, which was stationed there. The message was, that the presence of this corps was 'urgently,' though, probably, only temporarily required. This order reached its destination on the morning of the 13th of March. Within twenty-four hours the regiment was embarked, and under steam for Calcutta. These and other preparations being completed, Lord Canning in a minute dated March 27th, recapitulated all the facts, and announced that the 19th regiment of the Bengal army was to be disbanded. In the general orders issued on the same day, the Governor-General said with force and truth : —

'Neither the 19th regiment, nor any regiment in the service of the Government of India, nor any Sepoy, Hindoo or Mussulman, has reason to pretend that the Government has shown, directly or indirectly, a desire to interfere with the religion of its troops. It has been the unvarying rule of the Government of India to treat the religious feelings of all its servants of every creed with careful respect: and to representations or complaints put forward in a dutiful and becoming spirit, whether upon this, or upon any other subject, it has never turned a deaf ear.

'But the Government of India expects to receive, in return for this treatment, the confidence of those who serve it.

'From its soldiers, of every rank and race, it will at all times, and in all cases, enforce obedience. They have sworn to give it, and the Governor-General in Council never ceases to exact it. To no men who prefer complaints with arms in their hands will he ever listen.'

In pursuance of this order, the 19th regiment was marched to Barrackpore, the head-quarters of the Presidency Division, and in the presence of all the native corps there stationed, was solemnly disbanded by General Hearsey, the main part of two European regiments, the body-guard of the Governor-General, and two batteries of field artillery being present to enforce the decision of the Government.

So far all was successful: General Hearsey was even cheered by the disbanded men. The Governor-General had been meanwhile indefatigable in taking every possible measure to reassure the native troops on the subject of their fears. He had ordered a change in the drill exercise, whereby cartridges were no longer to be touched by the mouth, but only torn by the hand. But as in a constitution affected by cancer, on removal of the affected part, the disease breaks out at some new point, so this insane suspicion was now every week reappearing in some new form more malignant than before. Only two days previous to the solemn disbandment of the 19th regiment, a circumstance more ominous than any had occurred on the same spot. A Sepoy of the 34th Native Infantry, who seemed to be

drunk or maddened by excitement, had appeared in the lines of the cantonment at Barrackpore armed, and calling on his comrades to follow him 'in defence of their religion.' Not one of these comrades would step forward to arrest him; and when two European officers came up to do so, and were engaged in a hand-to-hand conflict with the fanatic, they were assaulted by a mob of soldiers from behind, and struck on the head with the butt-ends of muskets. The fight was only ended when the gallant Harsey himself rode up with his own hand to arrest the mutineer, who seeing himself likely to be overpowered, fired his musket into his own breast.

A new difficulty arose to Lord Canning out of the result of the court-martial which was held on this affair. One Sepoy, and one Sepoy only, had come to the assistance of the two officers who were wounded by the mutineer: he was a Mahommedan. After a prolonged inquiry into the spirit and temper of the regiment, the Court of Inquiry came to this most embarrassing conclusion, 'That the Sikhs and Mussulmans of the 34th regiment are trustworthy soldiers of the State, but that the Hindoos generally of the corps are not trustworthy.' Here was a distinction between creeds as affecting the fidelity of the native army never before heard of in the history of India. Could the Governor-General recognise it? If he did, there was no room to doubt what the effect must be on the race and faith which predominated in the army of Bengal. Lord Canning, with admirable judgment, determined that reward and punishment must be meted out to individuals and companies connected with this mutiny, according to the best evidence of the facts, but that no attempt must be made to 'draw a line of distinction between creeds.' The opinion of the court, however, is valuable as indicating the real origin of the mutiny, before its contagion had widely spread. Contrary to an opinion which still prevails, the revolt was Hindoo in its origin, and not Mahommedan. But Government could make no distinction except upon the ground of individual conduct. Two Sepoys were hanged who happened to be Hindoos, one or two were promoted and rewarded who happened to be Mahommedans, and the whole seven companies which had been present at Barrackpore, and had shown such sympathy with the mutineer, were disbanded.

This last conclusion was not arrived at until April 30th. The whole of that month had been occupied by courts of inquiry, before which much curious evidence was taken. Meanwhile no new or alarming symptoms had appeared. The disbandment of the 19th regiment on the last day of March,

and the capital executions of the Sepoys of the 34th which followed soon after, had seemingly arrested the mania of the Hindoos. The mutiny was suppressed in the Presidency of Bengal. On the 7th of May General Hearsey reported that he no longer required the European troops which had been sent to Barrackpore. It was even thought that the Queen's 84th Regiment might be restored to Pegue. But now at last, after three months' course in the lower provinces, the mutinous spirit appeared in Oude. On May 2nd, the 7th Oude regiment refused to bite their cartridges on parade. On the 3rd it was reported to Sir Henry Lawrence as in a very mutinous state. His action was immediate, and cannot be told more shortly than in his own words: —

‘Instantly a field battery, a wing of H. M.'s 32nd, one of the 48th and 71st Native Infantry, and of the 7th Cavalry, the 2nd Oude Cavalry, and 4th Oude Infantry, marched against it. The regiment was found perfectly quiet, formed line from the column at the order, and expressed contrition. But when the men saw the guns drawn up against them, half their body broke and fled, throwing down their arms. The disarmed 7th were ordered to return to their lines, and recall the runaways. They were informed that Government would be asked to disband the corps; but that those found faultless might be re-enlisted. The corps had, before the arrival of the troops, given up two prisoners and had offered to give up forty more.’

On this news reaching Calcutta it so happened that all the members of the Supreme Government took occasion to express or indicate their opinion on the character of the mutiny, and of the nature of the measures required to meet it. They did not then know that the supreme moment had already come, and that on the very day they wrote their minutes, the most terrible event in the history of British India had been irrevocably determined. But what they wrote is of infinite interest as a record of Lord Canning's policy. It was May 10th before Sir Henry Lawrence's report came before the Governor-General. He immediately recorded a minute that ‘Sir H. Lawrence had acted with promptitude, and should be supported in the course he had taken.’ He observed, however, with characteristic fairness and consideration towards the Sepoy, that an explanation should be given why biting of cartridges had been required at all, when the new platoon exercise had dispensed with it. Mr. Dorin, senior member of Council, thought disbandment an insufficient punishment. ‘The sooner this epidemic of mutiny is put a stop to the better: mild measures won't do it; a severe example is wanted.’ Major-General Low, concurring generally with Lord Canning, was disposed to believe in the

reality of the dread entertained by the men of loss of caste, and that probably the main body of the regiment did not refuse to bite the cartridges from any disloyalty or disaffection towards the Government. Mr. J. P. Grant concurred in this view, and thought that if more severe punishment were required, it should be limited to a few ringleaders. Mr. Peacock concurred with the Governor-General. These minutes from his colleagues called forth from Lord Canning a final minute, in which, after explaining his first more fully, he recorded the following memorable comment on the desire for 'severe measures' as a remedy for the distemper which prevailed :—

'I also wish to say, that it is my conviction that the measures which have been taken in dealing with the mutineers, HAVE NOT BEEN TOO MILD. I have no doubt that many rank offenders have not had their deserts; but I know no instance in which the punishment of any individual could, with unquestionable justice, have been made more severe; and I am not disposed to distrust the efficacy of the measures, because the present ferment, in running its course over the land, after being checked in the Presidency (of Bengal), has shown itself in Oude and in the North-west. I would meet it everywhere with the same deliberately measured punishments. Picking out the leaders, wherever this is possible, for the severest penalties of military law, visiting the common herd with disbandment, but carefully exempting those whose fidelity, innocence, or perhaps timely repentance, is fully proved.'

Up to this time the fears and suspicions of the Sepoys had been treated with entire success. Earnest and unremitting endeavours to satisfy their minds had preceded and accompanied every measure of punishment. Punishment itself had been, as Lord Canning required, strictly measured according to the evidence of individual conduct; and the only kind of punishment administered, except in the case of Sepoys concerned in an armed attack upon the life of their officers, had been the punishment of dismissal. This was a punishment which the Government had an undoubted right to administer, however genuine might be the dread under which the Sepoys had been moved to disobedience. The very sincerity of their fear, and the inveterate hold it had taken on their minds, was proof that they no longer trusted the Government which employed them. For this the best remedy was to leave its service. But so long as this mistrust had not led them into violence and crime, the 'severer measures'—for which there was already a cry, even in the Council Chamber—would probably be unjust, and would certainly be inexpedient. If the same gentleness and the same firmness which guided Lord Canning and Sir Henry Lawrence had guided the conduct of the military tribunals, there

is every reason to believe that the danger would have passed away.

Alas! Lord Canning's just and sagacious words, that the mutiny had 'not been treated too leniently,' received on the very day on which they were recorded, a terrible and memorable vindication.

On the 24th of April, eighty-five out of the ninety men of the 3rd Light Cavalry stationed at Meerut had refused to receive the cartridges tendered to them. A squad of military recruits having followed their example, were at once summarily dismissed. The Commander-in-Chief, General Anson, ordered the trial of the whole eighty-five troopers by general court-martial, and reproved the artillery officer for having taken the more lenient course of dismissing the recruits, observing that this was a punishment 'incommensurate with the offence.' The court-martial held under the impulse of this feeling pronounced upon the troopers, on the 8th of May, sentence of ten years' imprisonment with hard labour — a sentence tremendous anywhere, but doubly tremendous in the climate and in the prisons of India. On the following morning this sentence was announced to the whole native troops paraded for the purpose. The prisoners were subjected to the additional degradation of being publicly ironed in front of the brigade. General Hewitt reported with apparent satisfaction, after this operation had been completed, that it was one which 'the majority of the 'prisoners seemed to feel acutely.' No doubt they did — and others besides the prisoners felt it acutely, too. On the following evening — the 10th May — the comrades of the condemned men rose in arms — broke open the jail — liberated the prisoners, who had accumulated to the number of 1,200 men — shot down every European they could meet — and marched off to Delhi. On that memorable night the Great Mutiny of '57 had entered on its fatal course. All India was in a blaze.

We have thus gone with care through the earliest stages of the mutiny, up to the moment when it became rebellion, because the facts have never been correctly stated in a connected narrative. They were grossly misstated in a pamphlet, published in the course of 1857, 'By One who has served under Sir Charles 'Napier.' We do not know who this officer is. But the only characteristic in which he rivals the great captain under whom he has served, is the violence of his language and the recklessness of his assertions. This anonymous pamphlet would hardly be worth noticing now, were it not for the fact that, for a time, it completely supplanted the authentic information to be derived

from the official papers, and that from it were derived almost all the attacks made upon Lord Canning in the Parliamentary Sessions of 1857-8. There is still to be traced in the public mind an impression that though Lord Canning's measures were energetic and wise after the mutiny had entered on its final stage, they were weak and vacillating at first. How entirely erroneous this impression is, the facts we have recorded are an ample proof. It is true, of course, that neither he nor anyone else in India expected the mutiny to assume the proportions it ultimately did. But most probably it never would have assumed those proportions, if his just and considerate conduct had been everywhere pursued. The urgent anxiety he showed to reassure the minds of the Sepoys, and to take every possible measure to satisfy their reason on the object of their alarm, indicated an appreciation of the power and reality of their prejudices which, to this day, is very rare indeed.

On this point it is difficult to estimate the force of the evidence without examining the proceedings of the Courts of Inquiry and the courts-martial, held during March and April, at Barrackpore. One of the most striking facts elicited then was, the composition of the Sepoy regiments in respect to caste. The 19th Regiment, which was disbanded, contained 559 men of the highest castes — Brahmins and Rajpoots. The 34th Native Infantry — in which the mutinous spirit received the earliest and most serious development, and from which it had spread to the 19th — consisted of 1,089 men, of whom no less than 803 were of the Hindoo faith; and of these, again, no less than 335, including 41 of the native officers, were Brahmins. The consequence of this state of things may easily be supposed. Captain Aubert, of the 34th, says, in his evidence, 'nearly all the native influence in the regiment is in the hands of Brahmins, who have also a numerical superiority.' Captain Drury, another of the officers, informed the court that it was a common saying in the regiment 'that the corps was commanded by the Havildar-major Mooktar Persaud Pandey.' And who was he? He was the man in whose hut all the secret conferences were held — conferences in which each man inflamed the superstition of his comrade, by repeating and aggravating all the rumours of the camp — until the whole body was worked up to a frenzy of suspicion, not without whispers of revenge, and plans of treason. And why was this man's hut the favourite place of assembly? 'I went,' said one of the Sepoys, 'because he was a very high Brahmin; all the native officers are in the habit of going to his house and staying there for hours.' The reluctance of the men to arrest or shoot the murderous

Sepoy on the 29th March, is explained as a reluctance 'to kill a man of his caste.' It is not surprising that a brotherhood so close as this, bound together by a common superstition so irrational, should have been liable to uncontrollable fits of panic and alarm.

This was the root of the mutiny, and this continued to be its essential character throughout. It was this which gave it its passionate and fitful strength; it was this which constituted its organic weakness. There was no concert continuous or pre-arranged. There were only spasmodic bursts of sympathy;—for it is curious how much such affections of the mind seem to follow the same laws which govern diseases of the body. Contagion under special conditions seemed necessary to the spread of the poison. It ran a rapid and violent course among certain corps which had peculiar relations with each other, whilst others, apparently exposed to precisely similar conditions, remained for a time wholly unaffected. When Sir Henry Lawrence so promptly surrounded and disarmed the mutinous regiment at Lucknow, he led against them corps composed of precisely the same materials; and a single wing of one European regiment was the only alien element in the force which he commanded. There was no regiment in which the mutinous spirit took an aggravated form sooner than the 34th. But a few companies of that corps, which happened to be separated from their comrades at Dum-Dum, were entirely free from it, and addressed the Government deploring the disgrace which had been brought upon their body. The same curious phenomena continued to mark the progress of the mutiny, and to follow its decline. The thinnest partition of outward circumstances, or of mental association, seemed to prevent contagion, or to repel it. The entire armies of Bombay and of Madras escaped the plague. On the other hand, regiments which through many trials and abundant opportunity, had continued sound, were suddenly attacked by the mania, as by the breath of some poisoned air, and broke out at moments when success was hopeless, and when the frenzy could end in nothing but disgrace and death. The conduct of some of them reminds one of nothing so much as of the 'herd that ran violently down a steep place and perished in the sea.'

Those only who thoroughly understand this essential character of the Great Mutiny of 1857, can understand the inestimable value of Lord Canning's character and conduct. Panic is a disease which propagates itself. The one thing which, above all others, has power to stop its way, is a strong mind holding firmly its own self-control. In virtue of that power even a single voice, in the

midst of a raving crowd, is a voice gifted with command. Still more has it that power when the voice is the voice of one who rules. When the mutiny first assumed its alarming aspect, the European community in Calcutta rushed to the conclusion that the whole army was in one vast conspiracy. Signs and wonders, hardly less irrational than those which frightened the Sepoys, were quoted as proving that the whole native population were traitors, and that to trust a musket in any native hand was weakness amounting to infatuation. The same impulse extended to the public in England. It found expression in the most powerful members of the Press. It affected the mind of Parliament. Even Lord Derby spoke with bitterness of the too lenient punishments inflicted by Lord Canning, and stigmatised the mere disbanding of mutinous regiments as an 'act of madness.' We mention this merely to indicate the breadth and violence of the current against which Lord Canning stood so firmly. If Lord Canning had yielded to these natural impulses of anger and of fear, the mutiny must have become that which it never was,—a war between race and race, with wounds that could be never healed. It was given to him to resist this temper, with invincible moral courage, and a love of justice which will ever be dear to the memory of India and of England. The complaints and accusations made against him at the time are an immortal monument of his fame. We will take an instance. Throughout the mutiny Lord Canning persevered in showing his confidence in the native races whenever and wherever he had an opportunity of doing so. The employment of natives in civil office, long urged upon the Government of India, had been increasing during recent years. It is perfectly true that amongst the natives so employed, there were some instances of treachery during the height of the mutiny. But Lord Canning did not allow this fact to reverse a course of policy on which so much depends. The European inhabitants of Calcutta, in the petition which they signed for Lord Canning's recall, record it as one of the high crimes and misdemeanours of the Governor-General, 'that he had lately 'sanctioned the appointment of a Mahommedan to be Deputy 'Commissioner of Patna; and also the appointment of other Mahommedans to places of trust—to the great offence,' they are pleased to add, 'and discouragement of the Christian population 'of the Presidency.' To this and to some other similar accusations from the same quarter, Lord Canning's reply was: 'The 'Governor-General in Council has felt it an imperative duty 'to discourage, and as far as possible to repress, that feeling of

‘indiscriminate revenge which would confound the innocent with the guilty, and hold every Mahomedan and Hindoo in India responsible for the crimes committed by a comparatively small number of them.’ We bow with profound emotion before the memory of a man who could hold this language at such a time.

Lord Canning was right in feeling some confidence that native troops might still be trusted; but he was much more right in showing a far greater confidence than he felt. In that tremulous condition of the native mind, the sight of this confidence, and the expression of it, tended to delay, to mitigate, or prevent the assaults of bad feeling. On this principle, when the 70th Native Infantry, stationed at Barrackpore, petitioned that they might march against the mutineers who had seized on Delhi, Lord Canning lost not a moment in himself proceeding to the cantonment, and addressing to that regiment a speech of acceptance, of encouragement, and of thanks. The petition of the 70th, with the reply made to it, was immediately published as a general order by the Governor-General in council.

Wise as this conduct was because of its justice, it was still more wise because of its prudence. Lord Canning did not believe in a conspiracy of the whole native army; but if he had believed in it, he could not afford to say so. When the mutiny began he had, in the whole extent of the Lower Provinces only about 2,400 European troops. The native army within the same limits exceeded 29,000 men. Yet these are the provinces in which alone the mutiny never assumed dangerous proportions. At the time when the disaffection began, a single regiment constituted the whole European garrison of Calcutta and of the neighbouring station of Dum-Dum. In like manner one European regiment was all that Sir H. Lawrence had to rely upon, if the native army had been treated as under suspicion, in the turbulent province of Oude. But at the same moment that Lord Canning was showing confidence in the general loyalty of the Native Army he was taking instant precautions against their possible defection. As in the physical world, there are structures which strike the mind with sudden force as evidences of design, so, in the course of history, there are moments when we see almost with the eye of sense, the Hand which is guiding them to ordained results. The time of the Indian mutiny was one of these. Distant and unforeseen events had happened and were happening with nice coincidence precisely at the time which was the right time for saving India. The quarrel with Persia had been brought to an end sooner than was expected, and the whole of Outram's expedition was ready

to return. Another quarrel with China had arisen, and English regiments were already on the sea, passing within hail of India. Not an hour was lost by the Governor-General in sending up those rockets into the sky which told that the ship was in the midst of breakers. The public spirit of Lord Elgin and the energetic exertions of Lord Elphinstone responded with decisive effect to the Governor-General's appeals. When on June 3rd, Sir John Lawrence telegraphed from the Punjaub to Calcutta, suggesting a series of measures which he thought it absolutely necessary to take, Lord Canning was able to reply that every one of them 'had been taken long ago.' But there was another part of this message from Sir J. Lawrence which well indicates the dangers over which his tact and energy prevailed. It was true, as Lord Canning told him in reply, that Lawrence was 'better off' 'for Europeans than any other part of India.' It was also true that a large portion of the native troops in the Punjaub were those local corps which his illustrious brother and himself had raised, and which were separate in sympathy from the army of Bengal. Yet Lawrence telegraphed on June 3rd, not only that 'the whole' 'native army are ready to break out,' but that 'unless a blow' 'were soon struck, the Irregulars as a body would follow their' 'example.' It would be a great error to suppose that because this last danger was averted, it was not a real danger when Lawrence wrote. It was averted by the vigour and address with which the military spirit of the Irregulars was turned into a loyal course. No time was allowed for their minds to become exposed to the dangers of inaction. Lawrence knew that the only way to prevent defection was to act as if he had no fear and no suspicion. Accordingly, his local forces were hurled against Delhi as if they had been English troops; and in that memorable siege they showed not only a courage but a zeal and tenacity of purpose, without which in that terrible climate, and at that terrible season, our small European force could never have achieved success.

All these facts and all other facts of the mutiny,—both the things which did happen, and the things which did not happen,—prove beyond doubt that it originated in a real panic on the subject of caste. That panic spread among the close brotherhood of the Bengal regiments, because their constitution specially predisposed them to its influence.* But it does not follow that some political agencies may not have been at work to suggest, to aggravate, and to use the superstition of the

* We must refer to our former article, 'India under Lord Dalhousie,' for many of the predisposing causes.

Sepoy. It is certain that the panic began not in Oude, not in Delhi, but in the stations close to Calcutta itself. If we can rely on a statement of General Hearsey, this was no new fact in respect to the influence of Calcutta on the Sepoy mind. He wrote on February 8th, 'I moreover consider it necessary to add my conviction that the Sepoys are tampered with by designing villains, when on duty in Fort William and Calcutta, it having been frequently noticed by old military residents at the station that after frequent absences on such detached duty, many of them returned to their lines with strange ideas and unsettled minds.' This is not unnatural. Whatever elements of discontent exist in our Indian empire, have their head-quarters in the presidency towns, where they are aided by a smattering of European knowledge, and European habits of organisation. Thus, we find allusion to a Brahmin agency or religious Hindoo party called the 'Dhurma Sobha,' which, after the manner of its kind in other countries, had been angered by enactments of tolerance which were to it intolerable. The British Government had—not too soon—saved Indian widows from a frightful death; and still more recently it had saved them from a wretched life, by allowing them a legal second marriage. It is said, and it is quite possible, that agents of this 'religious society' had thought to frighten the Government from such iniquities by sowing the seeds of suspicion and distrust in the Native Army. It was said, too, that the dethroned king of Oude, or at least some of his ministers, had aided in this work. This is possible too, although there is very scanty evidence of the fact. But so far as the Royal Family of Oude is concerned, the party which opposed the annexation of that country have little reason to quote the mutiny in support of their opinions. It was their object to keep that family in Lucknow, as the representative of the House of Timour was kept at Delhi. We know what was the result and effect of this policy. It gave to the mutineers a standard and a name, and the semblance at least of a political object. On a smaller scale it would have been the same in Oude. It was inevitable under any circumstances that when the mutiny broke out, advantage should be taken of it by the powerful chiefs, each with his little army of retainers and his fortress, who had so long preyed on the country, and who under our Government could prey no longer. But this was the consequence not of our dethroning the king (which was his own fault), but of our assuming the government of the country, which on all hands was admitted to be necessary. The keeping of him as a puppet at Lucknow, on the old traditional system of 'the Company,'

would have only added an additional element of difficulty, and a convenient centre of intrigue. Oude was the only part of India where the mutiny of the soldiers assumed the character of a popular insurrection; and there it did so, not because the people cared for the king, but because one large portion of the people were the brothers and the friends of the mutinous Sepoys, and because another large portion of the people, namely, the military chiefs and their retainers, feared above all things the establishment of a powerful Government at Lucknow.

The view we have thus taken of the cause and nature of the mutiny is confirmed by an authority, who, perhaps more than any other man, is able to speak from the best opportunities of knowledge. Of the voluminous writings produced by the Indian mutiny we know no paper so interesting or instructive as the 'Letter from Sir John Lawrence, forwarding to the Governor-General of India the proceedings on the trial of the King of Delhi.' The result of that trial proved that the mutiny was simply a mutiny, and not an insurrection; that it originated in no political cause whatever, and was not connected with any previous conspiracy.

'Whatever may have been the king's participation in the events subsequent to the outbreak at Meerut, nothing has transpired on the trial, or on any other occasion, to show that he was engaged in a previous conspiracy to excite a mutiny in the Bengal army. Indeed, it is Sir J. Lawrence's very decided impression that this mutiny had its origin in the army itself; *that it is not attributable to any external or antecedent conspiracy whatever*, although it was afterwards taken advantage of by disaffected persons to compass their own ends; and that its proximate cause was the cartridge affair, *and nothing else*. Sir J. Lawrence has examined many hundreds of letters on this subject from natives, both soldiers and civilians. He has, moreover, conversed constantly on the matter with natives of all classes; and he is satisfied that the general — indeed, the universal — opinion in this part of India, is to the above effect.'

On the predisposing influence of caste, and the impossibility of avoiding giving offence to its insane alarms, Sir John's evidence is not less remarkable. It appears that a fear and suspicion of the designs of the Government was of long standing, and that the most ordinary measures of material improvement were as obnoxious to suspicion as the grease on the Enfield ball, or the glaze on the cartridge paper. A Rajpoot Brahmin Sepoy told Lawrence that 'more than five years ago the belief had existed, and had nearly brought on a mutiny—that the caravanserais for travellers, and the supply of depôts erected by Government on the Grand Trunk Road, were said to be devised with the object of destroying castes;

‘and that before long, impure kinds of food would be prepared in them, which the people would be forced to buy and eat.’

We have no intention of following in this article the events of the war. In outline, at least, they are vividly impressed on the memory of all. Everything depended on the siege of Delhi. It began on the 8th of June, and the city was carried by assault between the 14th and 22nd of September, 1857. The head-quarters of the insurrection then centred in Lucknow. The relief of that garrison by Havelock and Outram took place on the 25th of September. But the relieving force under Outram was in its turn besieged. The second relief, and the rescue of the women and children, was effected by Sir Colin Campbell on the 22nd of November; but the final defeat of the rebels was not accomplished till March 1858. The heroic defence of the Alumbagh—the successive reliefs of its garrison—and the final reconquest of Oude, must ever rank among the most memorable series of events in the military history of India. Alas! how few of the leaders whose courage and endurance triumphed in that contest are surviving now! Henry Lawrence was killed early in the siege. Havelock fell at the moment when he had achieved success. Sir J. Inglis is also dead; and whilst these sheets are passing through the press, we learn that Sir James Outram is no more. His noble conduct in yielding to Havelock the command to which his rank and his office entitled him, must be fresh in the recollection of our readers. But it was only consistent with his noble character. The Indian services may well be proud of Outram. He was the very type of the soldier-statesman of whom they have produced so many and such great examples. And Outram represented the class which he adorned, not as they once were, but as, happily, in later times, they have come to be—men who to the skill and vigour which first acquired our rule in India, have added the Christian virtues which can alone make that rule a blessing to the world and an honour to ourselves. Fierce in fight, but generous and compassionate in council, Outram loved the natives of India, and he carried their hearts by storm. They loved him as military races love a great soldier, and as subject races love a protector and a friend.

What the mutiny was in its origin it continued to be throughout its course—a fanatical burst of passion in a corrupted army, attracting to itself all the scattered elements of villany or of discontent which existed in the country, but nowhere representing a general insurrection of any race or of any religion. Proud as we may be of the small British force which conquered in so many fights, we have reason to be prouder still

of the command we exhibited over the thousand tribes belonging to our vast and varied empire. There was hardly one of the battles we fought and gained in which we did not depend largely on native troops. The very names borne by the different corps which fought for us in the mutiny seem to represent the width and the strength of our dominion. When the small brigade which could be formed at Meerut moved out to advance on Delhi, the first important accession of strength which it acquired was the 'Sirinoree Battalion of Goorkhas.' To this body was intrusted the very key of our position, and it lost half its numbers in killed and wounded. The ponderous siege trains wended their laborious way to the same point under the escort of the 'Nabha Contingent' and of 'Farquhar's Beloochees.' There was the 'Jheend Horse.' There was the 'Cashmere Contingent.' There was the 'Mooltanee Horse. There was the 'Kumaon Battalion.' There were 'Coke's Puthan Borderers.' On the burning Ridge, from which our little army maintained the siege, no louder cheers were given than when the 'Punjab Guides' came bounding into camp on the morning of the 9th of June. For whence had they come and how? From the far frontier of Peshaur—a distance of more than 600 miles—marching at the rate of twenty-seven miles a-day,—every day for three weeks—at a season when the thermometer was standing at 110° in the shade! Nor did they fight less bravely than they marched. Within a few hours of their arrival they were in fierce and triumphant action with the enemy. The three storming columns which assaulted Delhi numbered together 2,850 men. Of these 1,425—a clear majority—were native soldiers. Of the reserve column numbering 1,200 men, 950 were native, and only 250 British. At Lucknow, the defence of the Alumbagh would have been impossible but for the incomparable fidelity of the Sikhs and Hindoostanees,—who formed a principal part of the slender garrison. When the contest must have seemed to them hopeless, they sacrificed every remaining chance of their own safety—resisting every inducement of corruption, defying every thought of fear. Thank God, whatever lessons the mutiny has left behind it, this at least is not among them—that native troops may not be trusted. At no period of our rule did we trust them more—at none did they better justify our trust. It may confidently be said that our mastery over the native races has received in the war of 1857 a new and splendid illustration.

Such having been the mutiny in its character, what was it in its effects? On what points connected with the Government of India did it throw any light really new? This is a large

question, for there is hardly any matter connected with that Government on which it did not rouse, or revive debate. Immense, therefore, as the subject is, we must trace at least in outline what the results of the great mutiny have been—in India and at home—on the form and on the work of government—on the instruments of our administration, and on its principles.

Of all the changes which resulted from it, probably the least important in itself was that on which all eyes for a time were fixed. ‘The Government of the Company had broken down!’ There never was purer nonsense. The Government of India was not the Government of the Company, and it had not broken down. But the delusion under which a mere legal fiction was spoken of as if it were a reality showed that it was high time that the fiction should be done away. Whatever errors had been committed in the Government of India had been the errors of the Crown—of its responsible ministers in England or in India. The Company, as a governing body, had been dead for more than seventy years. It had been dead, but not buried. Its skin had been preserved, and set up as if it were still alive. In its name all acts were still done in India; in its voice all orders were still sent out from home. Its real condition was notorious, yet habitually forgotten;—published in repeated Acts of Parliament;—confessed and explained by Ministers of State, yet constantly spoken of as if all these enactments were unknown,—as if all these confessions were disbelieved. There never was such an instance of the power of mere names. Some ninety years before, when the agents of the real ‘Company’ had ruled and plundered Bengal under the pretended Government of a Nawab, the scandals of this system had been denounced under the name of a ‘Double Government.’ The indignant oratory of Burke had kept fresh its hated memory in the noblest passages of English eloquence. All trace of that system, and of its evils, had passed away. The very elements out of which it had been born had ceased to exist long before the birth of the present generation. But the sound of this opprobrious epithet had been carried on by tradition through all changes of time and circumstance, and its virtue as a term of reproach survived when all knowledge of its original meaning had been lost. Every man who had a grievance, just or unjust, real or supposed, against the Government of India, still babbled against it as a ‘Double Government.’ There is a sense, indeed, and an important sense, in which it was true that the ‘Government of India’ was, and must always be, a ‘double Government.’ There was the Government in India and there was the Government in

England. But this 'doubleness' is a necessity of the case, and remains now precisely as it was before. The only other shadow of a meaning which had been left to this expression, was the 'doubleness,' which consisted in the Indian Minister sitting in Cannon Row, and his Council sitting in Leadenhall Street.

But the truth is, that this fiction of 'the Company' had become a nuisance from the inveterate misconceptions to which it had given rise. Its mischief was far greater in England than in India. It was a serious obstacle to the right understanding of all Indian questions. As Sir George Lewis accurately said, it 'threw obscurity on the seat of power.' But it did more than this—it weakened the authority of the Government of India. It made the Crown and the Parliament and the people forget their own responsibility, and induced them to cast wrongfully upon others blame which, if it attached to any one, attached to themselves, either directly or through those who represented their authority and wielded their power. On the other hand, the Court of Directors claimed on behalf of themselves merits which really belonged to the Minister who controlled them,—or to the Governor-General who was practically independent of them,—or to that public opinion which did operate through Parliament, slowly but surely, upon the administration of Indian affairs. It would be difficult to say which was the greatest delusion of the two—the delusion which claimed all that was good for 'the Company,' or the delusion which condemned the Company for calamities which had not the remotest connexion with the structure of the Government.

But the Cabinet of Lord Palmerston were justified to take advantage of the feeling which arose from the events of the mutiny to get rid of forms which had long been emptied of all their meaning. It was time that the Government of India should assume an aspect and address corresponding to its real nature. This is all that can be said in favour of the change. But it is quite enough. On the other hand, there was nothing of any force to be said against the abandonment of a fiction so mischievous in its effects. It was not requisite to abolish anything which had ever been of the slightest value. There was no virtue in the fact that the Indian Council and the Indian Minister were never brought into personal communication. There was no virtue in the fact that part of that Council was still elected by the holders of India Stock. There was no virtue in the fact that despatches dictated by a Minister of the Crown should profess to come from 'the Honourable 'Court.' These features of the existing system it was necessary

to remove. But almost everything else might remain precisely as it had been since 1784. In respect to the distribution of power between the Minister and his Council, no change whatever was required. The Court had been, and the Council was still to be, advisers merely. Much discussion arose, as is usual in such cases, on points of very small importance — the exact numbers of the Council, and the preservation of an elective element. The echo of old cries still lingered in the ears of men; and they talked of numbers being necessary to ‘independence,’ as if the size of a Council could give the semblance of an authority which was excluded by direct provisions of the law. The only consideration of the slightest importance in determining the number of the Council was that it should be large enough to facilitate a convenient subdivision of the business. Lord Palmerston’s Government proposed that the number should be eight, all to be nominated by the Crown, but under restriction as to the qualifications of those who were to be eligible. After the change of Government, and the failure of Lord Ellenborough’s famous proposal, that certain English towns should elect a portion of the Council, the discussion ended in the number being fixed at fifteen—eight to be nominated by the Crown, and seven to be elected by the Council itself. The weight of this body, as the adviser of the Minister on questions of Indian administration, depends not on its numbers, but on the knowledge and experience of the men who compose it. The old ‘servants of the Company,’ who formed so large a part of the Court of Directors, were the only class in which this knowledge and experience could be found: and it is a just tribute to the noble qualities for government which have flourished in our civil and military services of the East, that Parliament has indicated those services as the principal source from which the Indian councillors of the Crown shall continue to be drawn.

As regards the administration of affairs in India, no change whatever of principle was required. We have, therefore, always doubted whether it was expedient to issue any Proclamation to the people of India, — such as that which the Cabinet of Lord Derby issued in the name of the Crown — as if any new authority were for the first time assuming their government. In respect to religious toleration there was nothing to promise, except an adherence to former practice. This is a far safer guide for the expectations of a people, than the words of a Proclamation, which are liable to endless misinterpretation. We agree with Lord Canning when he says (speaking, however, of another case), ‘I believe that the issue

‘ of Proclamations is not the surest or safest mode of influencing the natives of India. The experience of the past year has furnished examples of the ingenuity with which the meaning of such documents can be perverted, or their language misrepresented by the enemies of the State.’ The Government was not a new one, neither were its principles of administration to be new. Already the words of the Proclamation are used as an armoury for debate, and are quoted as consistent or inconsistent with the tenor of particular measures. ‘ We do strictly charge and enjoin all those who may be in authority under us, that they abstain from all interference with the religious belief, or worship of any of our subjects.’ Would this have prohibited the abolition of Suttee?—or the measure securing to converts their share of their family possessions?—or the act legalising the marriage of Hindoo widows?—or the support by ‘ grants in aid ’ of missionary schools? There is no end of such questions. The progress of society, and the advance of civilisation in India has ‘ interfered with,’ and must inevitably interfere more and more, with the habits and customs and legal principles of a barbarous religion. But every step in that advance could heretofore be contested only on general principles, of justice or of policy. In future they will be contested with reference to words of a Royal Proclamation which are not capable of definite interpretation. This is a dangerous position for a written promise coming from the Crown. It is like bringing the personal authority of the Sovereign within the circle of political contention. It would have been better, we think, to stand on the character which the Government of India had never forfeited, and which it required no new Proclamation to define.

On the very eve of its dissolution as the traditional representative of an independent power in the administration of Indian affairs, the Court of Directors was called upon to deal with an event which seems to gather up within the shortest compass all the difficulties and anomalies connected with the form of government at home, together with perhaps the most formidable of all questions affecting our rule in India. In January 1858 the army of Sir Colin Campbell was being concentrated for the capture of Lucknow and the final subjugation of Oude. Lord Canning moved from Calcutta to Allahabad to be near the seat of war, and to determine on the course to be pursued for the pacification of the great province which the mutiny had temporarily wrested from us. He found it to be as clear in Oude as in the rest of India, that the defeat of our Government would have been the triumph of anarchy. There was the party of the

Begum and her son claiming to represent the royal family of Oude; there was the party of a Mahomedan fanatic called the Moulvie; the party of the Nazim, an adventurer without rights or property in the province; the Sepoys who sold their services to the highest bidder, and the Talookdars and Zemindars, all jealous of each other, and ready to devastate and plunder as before. But all these factions had been equally hostile to the British Government. Yet there was one class, at least, for whom we had done much during the single year of our rule, and from which therefore it had been expected—perhaps unreasonably—that we might derive some support. This was the village proprietors—the actual occupiers of the soil. The condition of this class when we took possession of the country had been one of unparalleled depression. Their rights had ceased to exist, or were reduced to a mere shadow. They were completely in the power of the Talookdars, and were subject to every kind of oppression, tyranny, and exaction. We had restored their independence, and founded our Land Settlement mainly on a direct recognition of what we believed to be their old hereditary rights. But whether from their weakness or from other causes, this class had shown us no favour in our hour of need. In truth they had fallen again under the subjection from which we had redeemed them, and had joined the ranks of those who had risen in arms against us. Sir James Outram reported that the village communities had fallen too low to enable us to make them, with safety to ourselves, the basis of our Land Settlement in Oude. Lord Canning came to the conclusion that it would be absolutely necessary to start afresh. The universal character of the insurrection gave the right, and afforded the means, of doing so. It was impossible, indeed, to treat the people of Oude as we treated our own Sepoys, or the revolted subjects of our older provinces. Lord Canning therefore put aside altogether, in respect to Oude, the punishments of death, imprisonment, and transportation. But he determined to declare that the Government of India held itself free to deal with the land of Oude—disencumbered from engagements which had been considered favourable to the people, but which had failed to secure their gratitude or contentment. Those engagements had been cancelled by rebellion; and he deemed it indispensable that the Government should resume that right over the soil, which every Government in India has asserted in its dealings with the people, and which is the basis of all Indian finance. The moment therefore Sir Colin Campbell's columns had cleared the city of Lucknow, and the reconquest of the province was virtually secured, Lord Canning issued the

famous proclamation which rewarded a few faithful Talookdars by a perpetual confirmation of their estates, and declared that with those exceptions, and with the exception of such other persons as might establish similar claims upon the favour of the Government, the 'proprietary right in the soil of the province' was confiscated to the British Government, which would 'dispose of that right in such manner as to it might seem 'fitting.'

Translated into the English language, and interpreted by European ideas in respect to property in the soil, this was undoubtedly a sweeping measure. There was, however, at this time at the head of the Board of Control a statesman who knew India, and who ought to have known how different are the principles which prevail there, and which have been familiar to the people through all their history. Proprietary right in the soil, or a right which—whether so called or not—is virtually the same, belongs and has always belonged to the Government of India. It is only parted with under leases or 'settlements' more or less favourable to the feudatories and occupiers of the soil—which leases are constantly revised and altered under a power which is practically a proprietary power. To put an end to the first Settlement made in Oude on the ground of subsequent rebellion was a punishment strictly measured to the offence. It was one which native rulers under similar circumstances had always been in the habit of enforcing. It was one which did not touch the honour of the most sensitive Rajpoot or Brahmin. It was one, finally,—the only one—which would enable us to resettle the country under conditions better suited to the ascertained condition of the people. Nevertheless, the prudence of issuing such a proclamation was fairly open to discussion. Its terms were considered inexpedient by Sir James Outram on the spot, and the Indian Minister had an undoubted right to act upon his opinion in the matter. He was bound, however, to intimate that opinion in a manner consistent with Lord Canning's position, and with the maintenance of his authority in India. But there is one temptation which Lord Ellenborough cannot resist. Without being a great debater, he is the greatest orator in Parliament, and he will sacrifice much to the rhythm of a stately sentence. Seizing on the Secret Committee,—that strange instrument of Government devised by Mr. Pitt for bringing the will of the Minister to bear at once and secretly on the Government of India,—Lord Ellenborough issued against Lord Canning the celebrated despatch which very nearly destroyed the Cabinet of which he was a member. We can quite conceive the pleasure

with which ear and hand followed the march of these sounding periods:—

‘OTHER conquerors, when they have succeeded in disarming resistance, have excepted a few persons as still deserving of punishment, but have with a generous policy extended their clemency to the great body of the people.

‘YOU have acted upon a different principle; you have reserved a few as deserving of special favour, and you have struck, with what they will feel as the severest of punishments, the mass of the inhabitants of the country.

‘WE cannot but think that the precedents from which you have departed will appear to have been conceived in a spirit of wisdom superior to that which appears in the precedent you have made.’

Not content with this rebuke to the Governor-General, Lord Ellenborough—the man who had struck down the unfortunate Amciers of Scinde, and had annexed their country—condemned in no indirect terms the annexation of Oude, misrepresented broadly the grounds on which it had proceeded*, and implied a doubt whether we had any good right to hold the province. This ‘secret’ despatch was instantly published in England. Whatever were the merits of Lord Canning’s proclamation, this public denunciation of his conduct before all India, in the very crisis of a dangerous insurrection, was—and was felt to be—

* As this erroneous statement of Lord Ellenborough is a very common one, we may as well specify it here. It is as follows:—‘We dethroned the King of Oude and took possession of his kingdom by virtue of a treaty (1801), which had been subsequently modified by another treaty (1837), under which, had it been held in force, the course we adopted could not have been lawfully pursued; but we held that it (the treaty of 1837) was not in force; although the fact of its not having been ratified in England, as regarded the provision on which we rely for our justification, had not been previously made known to the King of Oude.’ This sentence is not expressed with the clearness usual in Lord Ellenborough’s writings. But the assertions it contains are as erroneous as they are confused and contradictory. First,—We did not profess to act under the treaty of 1801. On the contrary, Lord Dalhousie’s first step was to declare that treaty, and all other treaties, abrogated, because the King of Oude had not fulfilled them. Secondly,—It is not true that we ‘relied for our justification’ on any provision of the treaty of 1837, which was null. Thirdly,—It is not true that we derived advantage from the non-ratification of the treaty of 1837. On the contrary, Lord Dalhousie would have been delighted to proceed under it, if it had been in force. It gave him all he wanted—a right to seize the government. The king, however, was offered a better position than that treaty would have secured to him.

an outrage. Lord Ellenborough, with a manliness which is never wanting in his conduct, saved his colleagues by sacrificing himself. The Court of Directors, following in the wake of public opinion in England, passed a vote of confidence in Lord Canning. This may be said to have been the last important political act of 'the Company.' Once before, they had exerted against the same statesman the only formidable power which had been left them by Mr. Pitt; and, in spite of the Ministers of 'the Crown, had recalled the Governor-General, who was by law their 'servant,' but who had determined too ostentatiously to become their master. We do not regret the change which deprives the Council of the Indian Minister of this last remnant of original authority. It was one which never was, and never could be, exerted except under the protection of such an amount of public feeling in England as would find adequate expression in the British Parliament.

Meanwhile Lord Canning pursued his course of policy in Oude with complete success. The Proclamation, we believe, had little or no effect; because, practically, it never reached the people until acts had superseded words. They looked to what was done, not to what was said. Within little more than a month after the capture of Lucknow, almost all the large Talookdars of Oude had tendered their allegiance by letter, by 'vakeel,' or in person. Our officers had even in some cases to advise them to delay declaring themselves until the armed bodies of our own mutineers had been dispersed. Lord Canning impressed upon his agents that their 'dealings with 'the chief rebels should be as conciliatory as might be consistent with the dignity of the Government.' In proportion as the masterly arrangements of Sir Colin Campbell restored our military possession of the province, no difficulty was found in convincing the people that our 'confiscation of the proprietary right in the soil' was perfectly consistent with a resettlement on liberal conditions, according as their conduct might deserve. The principle on which this resettlement proceeded was that indicated by Sir James Outram. The events of the rebellion were assumed as proving that the village communities were too feeble, and too broken by the oppressions to which they had been so long exposed, to enable them to hold that position in Oude which had been given to similar communities in the Punjaub, and in our own North-western Provinces. The alternative was to lean more on the Talookdars as the responsible landholders, and to give a more general and more extended recognition to their position and authority. It must be remembered that the Land Settlement originally

ordered by Lord Dalhousie, and carried into effect during the first year of Lord Canning's Government, was avowedly experimental — to last only for three years, and to give way afterwards to such permanent arrangements as might be found on detailed examination to be most consistent with the real rights of the various parties having different interests in the soil. It was only pending this inquiry that the actual occupiers were to be assumed as having the primary rights which are involved in possession. This settlement was therefore perfectly consistent with the final recognition of the Talookdars in any capacity or position to which they might be found to have a just and reasonable claim. Whilst this first temporary settlement was going on, Lord Canning did not take any alarm as to its effect upon the people; nor did he admit that the events of 1857, as affecting Oude, were connected with the measures of the Government or the acts of its local officers. On the contrary, he tells us that 'the assessment was moderate, and the settlement on the whole was completed in conformity with the views then generally entertained of sound policy.*' But—whether rightly or wrongly may well be questioned—he assumed the rebellion as furnishing new evidence upon that policy—evidence which superseded the necessity of the more elaborate inquiry originally intended. He adopted the opinion that 'the maintenance of a territorial aristocracy is an object of so great importance that we may well afford to sacrifice something of a system which, whilst it has increased the independence and protected the rights of the cultivators of the soil, and augmented the revenues of the State, has led more or less directly to the extinction or decay of the old nobility of the country.' It was in pursuance of this policy that he determined to base the new Land Settlement on the claims of the Talookdars; but to limit their power, and guard it from abuse by such restrictions in their new grants as might protect the rights of the occupiers and cultivators of the soil.

We need hardly say that the virtue and even the justice of this system, will entirely depend on the force and efficiency given to these restrictions on the power of the Talookdars of Oude. Of Lord Canning's intentions to secure and protect equally all subordinate rights in the soil, we have no doubt whatever. But considering all that we know of the manner in which the Talookdars had acquired and had used their power, it is impossible not to have the strongest misgiving of any system

* Despatch, November 29th, 1859.

which should assume the *status quo* before our annexation of the province—or any approach to it—as the basis of the ‘proprietary rights’ which we are to sanction and support. Let us take one example:—there is a certain Rajah Maun Singh, of whom we are told by the Chief Commissioner that ‘several hundred square miles of the Baraith division had been depopulated by a Nazim of his family, who also practised revolting cruelties on the peasantry.’ His uncle—the founder of the family fortunes—was a trooper in a Sepoy regiment, and Maun himself had obtained his wealth through every kind of villany and every degree of crime.* Yet we understand that under the Talookdarce Settlement this representative of a ‘native aristocracy’ has been recognised as the owner of upwards of one thousand townlands, embracing some 500 square miles of territory. In our opinion far too great stress was laid on the complicity in rebellion of the village communities of Oude. It was not to be expected that they could resist the influences under which they were placed. In the first place, our mutinous Sepoys were their own brothers and cousins. In the next place, we had not disarmed the Talookdars, and their power remained, therefore, substantially unbroken. It was impossible that the villages could resist it, if they had been ever so disposed to do so. There does not seem therefore to be any good reason for sacrificing their proprietary rights in favour of those whose hostility to us was at least as certain, and far more active. It would indeed be most inexpedient in India to trace too far back the origin of existing powers. But in many cases in Oude the Talookdars were the recent and mushroom growth of anarchy and fraud. We are glad therefore to see that by directions of the Secretary of State in Council†, the special attention of the Indian Government has been called to the danger of a ‘violent reaction’ of opinion in respect to the ‘failure’ of our first settlement, and to the absolute necessity of so watching and modifying the Settlement with the Talookdars in Oude as to protect, as far as possible, the rights and property of the villagers of Oude. This necessity is all the more urgent since Lord Canning took the farther step of intrusting some of the Talookdars with a revenue jurisdiction over their estates, and of conferring on them at the same time magisterial powers. This is indeed a

* For an account of this man’s rise, and of his treacherous and cruel acts, see ‘Sleeman’s Journey,’ &c., vol. i. p. 66-7., and 143-45., as well as many other passages.

† See Oude Papers (July, 1861), Despatches of Sir Charles Wood, April 24th, 1860, and August 17th, 1861.

bold experiment. If it succeeds it will be a great triumph. But to judge whether it succeeds or not, we must be vigilant; and, if we are not vigilant, we shall not be just. We have no right to give such power to such men, unless we not only are willing to believe, but take care to see, that they do not abuse it.

Closely connected with this 'reaction of opinion' in favour of a native aristocracy, stands the measure which Lord Canning took at a somewhat later period on the transmission of inheritance by adoption. The conduct of the native princes during the contest of 1857-8 was indeed remarkable, and proves, if additional proof were needed, that the insurrection was essentially a mutiny, and nothing else. With few exceptions, they saw clearly that the success of the Sepoys would have been merely the success of a lawless soldiery, and that a power before which the British Government should succumb would be a power beside which they themselves could not stand an hour. Their weakness, indeed, made their fidelity in some cases of comparatively little value. The only one within the limits of British India who had any considerable military force, the Maharajah of Gwalior, was unable to restrain his army from joining the mutineers. This, however, it may be fairly said, was more our fault than his, because his troops were a contingent under the old subsidiary system, and virtually formed part of the army of Bengal. The friendly attitude assumed by the Government of the Nizam in the South of India, was the most important aid which we derived from any native State. But it is to be recollected that the infection of the mutiny never reached the Presidencies of Madras or of Bombay; and, on the whole, it may be said that the tendency of native States really powerful and really independent, is a point on which the events of the mutiny casts no additional light. It was well for us that there was no native State, either within or beyond our borders, which was sufficiently powerful and sufficiently independent to be tempted by the immense opportunity which our difficulties presented. It was fortunate for us that, before the Great Mutiny broke out, the 'Policy of Annexation' had made the Punjab our own, and that along no British frontier could we any longer see such an army watching us as the army of old Runjeet Singh. It was fortunate, too, that within our own external boundary we had no native prince to deal with in the position which had once been occupied by Holkar, or Scindia, or Tippoo. We had to deal with many native 'States,' but with not one native 'Power.' This makes all the difference. Those who talk of

the positive advantage of maintaining 'native States' should define what they mean. States that are little more than dependent Principalities — sovereigns that are little more than great nobles,—these may have, under some conditions, an important influence in the peaceful government of so vast a country. But the irresistible logic of events has proved that the safety of our empire in the East, and of the great interests which that empire represents, is incompatible with the existence, within the limits of India, of any formidable native Power.

But the direct assistance which had been given to us by some native chiefs, such as the Maharajah of Patteala, and the indirect aid which had been rendered by the passive but friendly attitude of others, determined Lord Canning not only to offer personal rewards to these princes individually, but to take the opportunity of announcing a more definite and a more favourable policy to the whole class than as a rule had prevailed before. It is not true indeed, as has been often alleged, that the policy of the Indian Government had been uniformly or even generally hostile to the old native States. On the contrary, Lord Canning admits that 'its orders in dealing with doubtful or lapsed successions have in many instances been liberal and even generous.' Lord Dalhousie, who is supposed to represent the view least favourable to native States, had declared that whenever there was a shadow of doubt in respect to the right of succession, that doubt should be ruled in favour of the native prince. But no general principle had ever been laid down, defining the circumstances under which such doubt would be admitted to exist. Each case as it arose had been dealt with on its separate merits, and the highest authorities were constantly divided as to the abstract principles of Hindoo law, and of paramount rights, which should be brought to bear upon each decision. The truth is that the practice in India had varied with the power of the paramount authority. Where it was weak the feudatories had encroached upon it,—where it was strong it had acted on its strength. Runjeet Singh, holding in his hand the reins of a powerful Government, had never recognised the right of adoption among the chiefs of the Punjab. Our own policy had varied, because the circumstances of different cases had been various. There is no analogy, for example, between such a 'sovereign' as the Rajah of Sattarah, whom we had ourselves set up, and the ancient States which had maintained a relative independence for centuries under the successive conquerors of India. Accordingly, by practice and by precedent, the privilege of transmitting

to adopted heirs their own rights of sovereignty or of chiefship, had, in respect to some of the great Indian Principalities, been established by our uniform acquiescence. This was the case with the whole group of native States which constitute what is called Rajpootana. Special intimations to the same effect, as a personal reward, had already been given to the great Houses of Scindia, Holkar, Rewah, Puttialla, and others of smaller name. What remained therefore to be done affected only a multitude of those minor principalities which are without political power, but which do certainly fulfil far better than the Talookdars of Oude the conditions belonging to a 'native aristocracy.'

Lord Canning, accordingly, suggested that the time had come when we might adopt and announce some rule in regard to succession to native States, more distinct than could be found either in our own previous practice or in that of former paramount Powers of India:—

'A time so opportune for the step can never occur again. The last vestiges of the Royal House of Delhi, from which for our own convenience we had long been content to accept a vicarious authority, have been swept away. The last Pretender to the representation of the Peishwa has disappeared. The Crown of England stands forth the unquestioned ruler and paramount Power in all India, and is, for the first time, brought face to face with its feudatories. There is a reality in the suzerainty of the Sovereign of England which has never existed before, and which is not only felt but eagerly acknowledged by the chiefs. A great convulsion has been followed by such a manifestation of our strength as India had never seen; and if this, in its turn, be followed by an act of general substantial grace to the native chiefs, over and above the special rewards which have already been given to those whose services deserve them, the measure will be reasonable and appreciated.

'Such an act of grace,—and, in my humble opinion, of sound policy,—would be an assurance to every chief above the rank of Jagheerदार, who now governs his own territory, no matter how small it may be, or where it may be situated, or whence his authority over it may in the first instance have been derived, that the paramount Power desires to see his Government perpetuated, and that on failure of natural heirs, his adoption of a successor, according to Hindoo law (if he be a Hindoo), and to the customs of his race, will be recognised, and that nothing shall disturb the engagement thus made to him, so long as his house is loyal to the Crown and faithful to the conditions of the treaties or grants which record its obligation to the British Government.'

One question immediately rises to our lips on reading this proposal:—What room is left for the discharge of our obligations to the people, as distinguished from the Rulers of Native States?

What is to be done in such a case as Oude? Is disloyalty to ourselves to be the only crime recognised in our dealings with native governments? Is incompetence or cruelty, or corruption — the ruin of a country, and the misery of its people — are these to be tolerated, and if tolerated, then virtually protected by the paramount Power in India? Happily Lord Canning did not leave in doubt the answer he would return to questions such as these. He says, 'The proposed measure will not debar the Government of India from stepping in to set right such serious abuses in a native Government as may threaten any part of the country with anarchy or disturbance, nor from assuming temporary charge of a native State when there shall be sufficient reason to do so. This has long been our practice.' Lord Canning reminds us that even Sir George Clerk, who represents the school most favourable to the preservation of native States, had said, in speaking of a particular case in the Hill Country, 'The proper punishment for the paramount State to inflict for gross mismanagement and oppression such as prevails to a considerable extent in those hills, would be the sequestration of the chieftaincies.' But Lord Canning goes on to say that in his own opinion 'the penalty of sequestration or confiscation should be used only when the misconduct or oppression is such as to be not only heinous in itself, but of a nature to constitute indisputably a breach of loyalty or of recorded engagement to the paramount Power.' We are bound to say that we do not concur in this opinion. There was no breach of loyalty towards the British Government on the part of the rulers of Oude. Except, therefore, upon a higher principle than this, we could not have permanently rescued the people of that distracted country. But the duty of protecting the people of India from rulers who are hopelessly bad, we hold to be a duty at least as binding on us, as the duty of maintaining our own dominion. Subject to these important reservations, there is much to be said in favour of Lord Canning's policy on the question of adoption. Liberal as this policy was, towards native princes, any evil likely to arise from it was greatly modified by two important qualifications — first, that it was specially confined to princes at that time in the actual exercise of ruling power over their own States; and secondly, that no general intimation was to be made upon the subject, but that a separate notice of the intention of the British Government was to be given to each chief to whom it was individually meant that it should apply. The first of these limitations excluded the case of all native States in which we had already assumed the powers of Government, even though the nominal sovereignty of the native

prince might still be maintained. The second limitation secured the power of excluding each particular case in which the expediency of continuing a native 'Raj' might be considered doubtful.

The links which bind together all the greater questions of our administration in the East at once drew into discussion, as inseparably connected, the reconstruction of the Indian army and the re-establishment of Indian finance. Both had for the time been shattered. Of the great army of Bengal, numbering in regular infantry alone upwards of 74,000 men, only eleven battalions remained with arms in their hands when the mutiny was quelled. In finance, the condition of the Empire, which before the mutiny had been good, exhibited at the close of the war an alarming deficit, and a certainty of the debt being more than doubled. But this was not all. Opinions prevailed in respect to the new military system which seemed to render economy impossible, whilst the difficulty of devising new sources of revenue was one among the standard traditions of Indian statesmen. These difficulties, again, tested, in the course of their discussion, the working of the Local Government of India, and led to a material change in its form and structure. On all these matters the solution arrived at belongs, not indeed exclusively to Lord Canning, but wholly to Lord Canning's time; and on each, therefore, it falls within the scope of this article to present an outline of the results.

We shall take the last of these questions first. The history of the Councils in India is curious, but may be shortly told. The original intention of the Company in establishing councils was to check their governors; and when Parliament first interfered by the Act of 1773, the same idea prevailed. The four councillors of Bengal, as well as the Governor-General, were named by the Act, and the decision of all questions rested with the majority, — the Governor-General having only a vote, and a casting vote. It was under this system that the famous contest arose between Warren Hastings and Sir Philip Francis, who commanded for a time a majority in the Council. Mr. Pitt's Act of 1784 did not directly put an end to this state of things, but indirectly it did. It had been the death of one member of the Council which had made Hastings suddenly supreme in his own Council; because having one supporter, and his own casting-vote, he could always command a majority. It must have been with some reference to this obvious result, that Pitt's Act of 1784 reduced the number of councillors from four to three. The consequence, of course, was that if the Governor-General had even one supporter, he could always

command a majority of votes. But beyond this the Act of 1784 did not go. One clause, indeed, was intended to prevent the Governor-General from exercising the power of his majority to such an extent as to muzzle his Council altogether. He could not defeat by adjournment beyond the second time, the discussion of 'any matter or question' brought forward by a councillor. Under this system free discussion was at least secured, and in the extreme case of the Governor-General standing absolutely alone, he might be overruled. But two years later Mr. Pitt made important changes, and established the relations between the Governor-General and his Council very much on the footing on which they have ever since remained. In all executive matters the Governor-General was made supreme, although in respect to making 'general rules and regulations,' he was still left dependent on having at least one supporter. This distinction was not important, because all the real power of the Indian Government lay in executive rather than in legislative action. Practically the Governor-General was supreme, and his authority extended over the minor Presidencies, although in all matters in which this supreme authority was not actually interposed, the local governments had full executive and legislative powers. The Act of 1833 first established a 'legislative' as distinct from the Executive Council, by adding a single member to the ordinary Council when sitting for legislative purposes. But the same Act still farther concentrated power in the hands of the Governor-General over his own Council, and extinguished any legislative authority in the local governments. Even their executive functions were restricted within narrow limits, by their being deprived of all power of independent expenditure. It was as some remedy for this, that the Act of 1853 enlarged the Legislative Council, and added representative members from the minor Presidencies. The Act of 1853 made no change in the powers of the Council, but only in its numbers and composition. But practically this enlargement of size,—the habit of holding its sittings or debates in public,—new 'standing orders,' which simulated the forms of Parliament, and, last not least, an increase of legal members, led to consequences which threatened, at one time, to be a serious embarrassment to Lord Canning's Government. On the whole, however, it is fair to say that the Council, as constituted under the Act of 1853, had not worked ill in matters of legislation. It passed many useful Acts, and the Governor-General had been supported in all the measures he proposed. But the entire incapacity of such a body to assume the functions of a representative assembly for the whole of India, must be apparent

at a glance. The change recommended by Lord Canning was adopted by the Home Government, and received the sanction of Parliament in the session of 1861. It was a change of the highest importance in respect to the local Government of India. Its object was twofold; first, to break up the relative importance of the Supreme Legislative Council by subdividing its work among a number of separate bodies; and secondly, to restore to the minor Presidencies a large share in the executive and legislative powers which had been taken from them by the Act of 1833. The European community of Calcutta has an opportunity of working off its steam in a local Council for Bengal. The Act specifies a list of imperial subjects with which these local Councils cannot interfere. There still remains a Supreme Executive and a Supreme Legislative Council. The members of the Executive Council are each charged with the responsibility of a separate department, and are in fact the cabinet of the Governor-General. In the Legislative Council the nominated members sit for two years only, so as to afford opportunities for change. Room is left for the admission of distinguished natives, who may be selected as really capable of representing the opinions of the native princes and the native people. But the preponderance of official members is secured; and undue interference with the Executive is prevented by a strict reservation on behalf of the Government of the Initiative in all legislative proceedings. The supremacy, too, of the Governor-General is maintained.

Where a really representative government is impossible, and a strong executive is a necessity, this seems the best principle on which to construct the machinery of the Indian administration. There are no materials in India for any legislative body which is not kept in complete subordination to the Governor-General, and above all to the Government at home. A Calcutta legislature would be the legislature of a class in its worst and most aggravated form. The 'public opinion' of India is virtually the opinion of the small but powerful European community. Its interests are mainly commercial, and its ideas of policy and of law are liable to the bias and insuperable temptations which commercial interests involve. Traditional jealousy made the old servants of the Company a powerful resisting force, and hence the outcry which has been raised against the official class in India. But the years succeeding the mutiny were years of reaction, and not even Lord Canning's sagacity and firmness were proof against the current which set in so strongly in favour of British settlers in India. In the special penal legislation, which was unfortunately adopted by the Government

of India, for the enforcement of indigo contracts, we have a conclusive proof of the necessity for having a controlling authority at home which shall be competent, vigilant, and strong. We cannot here enter on that question in detail. But we must record our hearty approval of the veto which has been put by the Secretary of State in Council on all legislation tending to entangle the Ryots of Bengal in a virtual serfdom to the European planter. We rejoice also in the proof which the same transaction has afforded that the public opinion of the English people and of the English Parliament, may on such questions be safely trusted. There never was a more idle fear than the fear so often expressed, of the danger of bringing Indian questions into discussion in Parliament at home. The action and the principles of Parliament have always been generous towards the people of India. The support which Sir Charles Wood and his Council has received from the public voice, in resisting Class Legislation in the planting interest, is a happy indication that the Government of India under the Crown will not be suffered to degenerate into a Government more commercial in its spirit than the old Company ever was, or less careful of native rights.

The necessity of maintaining for the future a much larger proportion of European troops, was the first conclusion which every man drew instinctively from the events of the Great Mutiny. Under the impulse of feelings natural after so great and so narrow an escape, the tendency was to overestimate the change which was really needed. Eighty thousand men was the number to which opinion pointed as the minimum required for safety, and at the present moment we have nearly 72,000. We have seen that, when Lord Dalhousie left India the British force had been reduced to 45,300 men. Whatever doubt there might be as to the exact figure at which it should stand in future, there could be no doubt that it had been dangerously reduced and must be largely reinforced. But how should this reinforcement be contrived? Should it be contrived simply by increasing the number of regiments of the line stationed in India; or should it be by a large increase in the small local European force whose service was confined to India,—which had been lately increased by 3,000 men,—but which had not yet been raised to the maximum allowed by law? On this question an irreconcilable difference of opinion arose between a large proportion of Indian statesmen and the Government at home. This was natural enough. The truth is that they looked at the question from two different points of view—the one having exclusive reference to Indian interests and Indian

traditions, the other having reference to the interests of India only as part of the general interests of the Empire. Lord Dalhousie had felt the risk and the inconvenience of depending so entirely on the Home authorities for the number of European regiments left at his disposal. The circumstances under which Lord Canning had been placed impressed the same feeling still more deeply on his mind. Considerations different, but not less powerful, in the same direction, told upon the views of the old Indian services both civil and military. The special and almost exclusive right of those services to all the great employments connected with the administration of India was the very essence of all that had separated the nominal Government of 'The Company' from the Government of the Crown. Already for some years there had been some tendency to encroach upon their privileges, by importing 'Queen's officers' into Indian employments; and the lion's share, which these officers had always enjoyed of the highest military commands, had been a standing subject of jealousy and of natural complaint. It was instinctively felt that a measure which should largely increase the preponderance in India of the army of the line, would place the old local services at a relative disadvantage. It is not surprising, therefore, that both the Indian services, and the Governor-General, backed by the Councils both in India and in England, strenuously urged, though on somewhat different grounds, that the reinforcement of the European army should consist, in large proportion, of an addition to the local force.

On the other hand it was equally natural that the Imperial Government should regard this proposal with suspicion. In the first place, that Government was not likely to recognise the doctrine that the free exercise of its discretion on Imperial interests, was a danger against which India, as a separate Government, was required to guard. In the second place, unless the whole minimum force of European troops required for the safety of India were to be of local troops, the Indian Government must still be dependent on the Government at home. Yet no man went so far as to make this proposal. In the third place, even the half measure of making only a moiety of the European force local in its terms of service, involved a novelty of the most formidable kind. And in the fourth place, this new measure,—broadening and deepening the separation between the army of India and the army of the line,—was to be taken at the very time when the two Governments had been brought into nearer and closer union, and when a free interchange of employment between the two services had

been warmly recommended as just in itself, and an indispensable step in military reform.

In this, as well as in our previous article, 'India under Lord Dalhousie,' we have had abundant occasion to observe how old debates had been renewed, and old questions of principle revived during the years we have passed under our review. This question, in respect to the local European force, is another instance. Precisely the same proposal had been made—precisely the same tendencies of opinion had been brought to issue—in 1788. The great Minister who had rescued the commerce of the Company and the patronage of India from the political advisers of the Crown, resisted firmly an attempt of the Company to establish in India a powerful European force distinct from the army of the line. • Very early in the history of the East India Company the jealousy of Parliament had placed a limit on their power of raising recruits in Europe. One of the first acts of the New Board of Control erected by Mr. Pitt in 1784, was to insist on a great reduction of the Company's forces. Four years later there was an alarm of a renewed contest with the French both in India and in Europe; and it became necessary to strengthen our European garrison in the East. Four more regiments were to be sent. The Company made a vigorous attempt that the whole of these corps should belong to their own local Europeans. Mr. Pitt as vehemently resisted their desire. There seems to have been nothing that has ever been debated since, which escaped his eagle eye. He resisted the Company avowedly on the ground that the change which was really expedient was a change in precisely the opposite direction,—namely, a change towards a consolidation of the two armies, and not towards a more effectual separation. He declared that such a consolidation was undoubtedly to be wished for, and that '*sooner or later it must be attempted.*' Mr. Pitt carried his point, though by a smaller majority of the House of Commons than was usual in his first triumphant Ministry. In the same year the maximum of the local European force was fixed at 12,000 men. This limit was never actually reached; and in 1796 they were reduced to two regiments of five companies,—or, virtually, to one regiment of infantry in each Presidency. And so matters had remained till, as we have seen, the necessity of withdrawing line regiments from India to serve in the Russian War had led in 1856 to an Act being passed raising the maximum of the local European force from twelve to twenty thousand men. When the mutiny broke out, it still only stood, at three regiments in each Presidency, or about 9000 men in all. This was exclusive of the Indian

artillery, which had always been entirely local and was a force of admirable efficiency. But now the demand made was one of a much more formidable kind. The Military Committee of the Indian Council were of opinion that, of the total European force to be maintained in India, the whole of the artillery, three-fourths of the cavalry, and two-thirds of the infantry, should belong exclusively to the local service. Lord Canning himself urged that on no consideration should the proportion be less than one-half.

Whatever might be said for this proposal, one thing at least was clear,—that such a measure would have been a far more ‘organic change in the military system by which India ‘had been won and kept,’ than the opposite measure which had been contemplated by Mr. Pitt,—viz., that of dispensing with local Europeans altogether, and officering the native army on some system which would consolidate the two services instead of keeping them apart. Lord Canning did not affirm, as some others did, that the comparatively small force of local Europeans which had been hitherto maintained, had formed any principal element in our Indian military system. On the contrary, he admitted that ‘forming as they did a very small portion of the Indian Army, they had been until lately almost overlooked ‘by their successive commanders-in-chief.’ Lord Cornwallis had declared, in 1786, that with the exception of the corps of artillery, he had nothing but the king’s regiments of the line ‘that deserved the name of an European force.’ In more recent times the Company’s regiments had indeed borne a high character in the field, and had taken a brilliant part in all our Indian wars, but still the Duke of Wellington had borne emphatic testimony to the relative inferiority of their military discipline. This, indeed, was admitted by Lord Canning, and to some extent by the most distinguished Indian officers themselves. The risk of mutiny among European troops in India, is not, perhaps, a formidable danger. It was, however, constantly urged as a plea for a divided army. But in so far as this danger could be contemplated at all, it undoubtedly told against a large force separated from the army of the line. Without anticipating positive mutiny, it is certain that a powerful army, having special relations with India and the native troops—watching with envious eyes every command given to officers of the line, and turned in a spirit of jealousy towards the ‘Horse-Guards,’ or, in other words, towards the authority of the Crown—would have been a serious embarrassment to the Government.

The Cabinet of Lord Palmerston therefore rejected this

proposal of the Indian services. Only one alternative remained—the ‘consolidation’ which Mr. Pitt had foreseen to be inevitable. There was all the more reason to adopt this course since several of the measures involved in it had been already urgently recommended as in themselves most desirable, if not absolutely required. Such, for example, was the formation of a ‘staff corps,’ from which, instead of from the regiments, might be drawn the officers employed throughout India in the infinite variety of duties belonging to the administration of the country. We have seen that this measure had been pointed to by Lord Dalhousie as the only remedy for an evil which involved serious danger to the discipline and fidelity of the army. Sir Henry Lawrence had urged its adoption as the most important conclusion to which he had come on military reform. Not less general was the concurrence of opinion that eligibility for the staff corps, or for a staff employment, ought not to be confined to officers of the local service, but should be open also to qualified officers of the line; and Lord Canning recommended that there should be a free exchange between both services. But this is ‘consolidation’ or ‘amalgamation.’ It was surely more consistent with this system that native troops should be the only local force, and that the whole European army should belong to the army of the line, and be available for the general service of the Empire. The only real danger of the amalgamation has reference to the officering of the Native Army. This must always continue to be a matter of the very first importance. It would be a serious evil indeed if, under the new system, the old school of officers who organised and commanded corps belonging to the native races, should be broken up. But the intention of the Staff corps is to constitute a body from which such men may continue to be drawn—men devoting themselves to the Indian local service, and casting in their lot with it. We do not see why the same encouragements and the same prospects of distinction should not tell as strongly in favour of that service as it has ever done. This, however, must be watched with care.

It marks how small was the amount of legal change required, and how little it altered the statutory system of Indian Government, that the ‘Amalgamation Act’ passed in 1860, was an Act of a single clause, simply providing that Europeans should no longer be recruited for local service in India. All other changes have been effected by the ordinary action of the Executive Government. They have had no necessary connexion either with the extinction of the Company’s nominal position, nor with the ‘Amalgamation Act.’ They would

have been equally competent to the Court of Directors and the old Board of Control, and most of them have been determined by considerations of efficiency and economy, as well as by the light thrown on the defects of our military system by the Great Mutiny of 1857-8.

Concurrently with these questions as to how the army of India should be reorganised, arose the questions not less difficult, how the finance of India should be reestablished? The effects of the mutiny may be told in a few words. In the year before the outbreak the revenue and the expenditure had been almost exactly equal. During the three years 1858-9-60 the aggregate deficiencies exceeded 30 millions. In 1857 the capital of the Indian public debt had stood at (about) 59½ millions. In February, 1860, it exceeded 90 millions. Even at that date the mutiny had added above 30 millions to the Indian debt. We have reason to believe that at the moment at which we write the annual deficit is not yet extinguished; and the Indian debt has risen to about 100 millions. But if the effect was alarming, at least the cause was simple, and the remedy obvious. The cause was enormous military expenditure, and the remedy must be mainly, if not exclusively, military reduction. In 1856-7 the total military charges had been below 11½ millions. In 1858-9 they were upwards of 21 millions. One half of the whole British army was quartered on the revenues of India, and the native force, instead of being smaller, was vastly larger than it had been before the mutiny arose. The European troops of all arms amounted to 112,000 men, whilst the native troops, including the irregular levies, and the military police, had risen to the enormous figure of 310,000 men—an excess of about 50,000 over the native force as it had stood in 1856. But the Government of India found itself not only in the face of an enormous deficit, but in the face of opinions on its future military system which would have rendered escape from that deficit impossible. The military commission appointed in this country to inquire into the subject, were unanimous that the number of European troops to be kept in India should not be less than 80,000 men; and farther, that the proportion this force should bear to the native troops should never be less than one to three, and in many districts should be one to two. The native army must therefore be from 180,000 to 200,000 men. Although this purely professional opinion was at once perceived to be impracticable by the Government at home, yet it was hard to see how retrenchment could be carried so far as to restore an equal balance to the Indian Exchequer. Two millions annually—on which there

could be no reduction—had been then already added to the expenditure on the interest of the debt alone; so that unless the military establishment could be reduced even below the amount at which it had stood before the mutiny, it was impossible that, with the existing revenue, the Government could escape from a position of permanent embarrassment.

It was under the pressure of this difficulty and alarm that the Government of India was compelled to consider the question of new taxes. But it could not consider this question without bringing under review the whole of its existing system of revenue. Accordingly every part of that system has been eagerly discussed—tested by every kind of theory, criticised by every kind of interest—not without large results on its actual condition, and still larger promise of reforms to come.

In estimating the ability of a people to bear new taxes, it is a common mode of stating the case, to divide the total revenue by the number of the population, and to represent the burden they bear as so much per head. The result obtained is then compared with the result of a similar calculation in respect to England, or some other country. The process looks very neat; but like many other processes of the same kind, it is entirely worthless. The oppressiveness of a burden does not depend on its absolute weight, but on its relation to the strength of the back which is required to bear it. The rate per head of taxation which is light to the prosperous farmers of England, would ruin the cottier peasantry of Connaught. It is idle to compare the taxes of two nations unless we have first compared their wealth. Yet this sort of comparison was common in discussing the possibility of new Indian taxes. And there was another fallacy not less deceiving. One half—in round numbers—of the whole revenues of India was the revenue derived from land.* This, it was argued, was no 'tax'—it was only rent. But as regards the ability of those who pay this revenue, to bear new taxes, it matters nothing whether their payment be called a 'rent' or whether it be called a 'tax.' That ability must be determined not by the name given to the portion of his substance which a man pays to the State, but by the amount which is left to him when that payment has been made. As regards the power of a people to bear new burdens it is quite the same whether they be overrented, or overtaxed. Now, what was the condition generally of the Indian Ryot—of the actual cultivator of the soil? Was it a condition of com-

* In 1858–59 the total revenue was 36,060,788*l*. Of this the land revenue was 18,123,659*l*.

fort and comparative wealth, or of poverty and comparative depression? There could be but one answer to these questions. Our Government in India had derived from its predecessors the dangerous inheritance of a landlord's power, and a landlord's right over a gigantic territory cultivated by millions of men. The best and wisest of our statesmen had been staggered by the enormous difficulties which attended the administration of such powers in the hands of Government. But amidst every variety of theory and of plan in respect to 'settlements' of land, one idea, one principle of policy, had been making steady way, and every hope of comfort and of progress was identified with its extended application;—and that was to make our assessments generally lower—and for longer periods. In other words, experience had taught us that, generally speaking, our rent-taxes, or our tax-rents, were too high, and our people were too poor. It was therefore universally conceded that whatever new taxes should be levied, they should be taxes affecting as little as possible the cultivators of the soil. But whilst our revenue system bore heavily on the Ryot, it bore very lightly on other classes of the community, and there were some—and these the richest—who contributed little or nothing to the necessities of the State. The only tax of any importance which bore on the general consumption of the people was the salt tax. This, it was thought, could bear an increase. The customs contributed less than one-fifteenth of the revenues of India. They also could bear an increase. But above all, there was no tax on the incomes of great proprietors or of capitalists, or of merchants. There could be no reason for this exemption. Accordingly resort has been had to all these sources of revenue. Others were proposed, but were subsequently abandoned, and the energetic protest of Sir Charles Trevelyan against them all, must be fresh in the recollection of our readers. That protest was of great value, in so far as it insisted that reduction could be carried very much farther than was contemplated at the time. But the establishment of an income tax was in our opinion a just and a valuable addition to the revenues of India. It is now producing about $1\frac{1}{2}$ millions. The total revenues of India have risen from about 37 millions, at which they stood before the mutiny, to about 44 millions for the present year. If the charges on account of the railway system be excluded, the expenditure is less than the revenue by above a million; and even taking those charges into account, the probable deficit for the current year is likely to be small. The new taxes, therefore, have been doing well, and their value will be infinitely enhanced if they can be used, as Sir Robert Peel

used new taxes here — not to support an extravagant expenditure, but to help the Government in reducing taxes which are more oppressive—more obstructive to the increase and accumulation of wealth.

This brings us to the question, which perhaps more than any other affects the condition of the people of India, and which has been brought to an issue of immense importance by the action of Lord Canning's Government. When Lord Stanley was at the India Office in 1858–9, he had directed an inquiry into the expediency of making the land revenue of India redeemable by the occupiers or proprietors of the soil. The idea which lies at the root of this proposal is that the land revenue, as it has been hitherto established, is a barrier to improvement. We believe it has. But is there no remedy for this except its total alienation? Affecting as the land-tax does the great mass of a population which is mainly agricultural, the kind of modification which is required is that which will most directly reach that mass, and give new motives to their industry. Is the power of redeeming their land assessment — of buying it up altogether — is this an offer which it is likely the Indian Ryot can accept? Living too generally from hand to mouth, having no capital except what he borrows from others, he has no means of purchase at his command. There are others who might take advantage of the offer; these would be either the wealthy 'Zemindars,' the large native proprietors, or more generally the European planters. It has indeed been always avowedly in the interest of this class that the proposal has been made. Lord Stanley's suggestion is expressly made with special reference to 'the importance of affording all possible encouragement to the employment of British capital, skill, and enterprise in the development of the material resources of India.' But important as this object undoubtedly is, it is not more important than the encouragement of native capital and native industry. Little would be gained by a measure which tends to favour the European planter, if it does not equally tend to favour the great bulk of that class from which the land revenue is derived. It is on them that the bad effects are operating most widely and most severely. It is in their interest and to their relief that any reform of the land revenue must be directed, if it is to tell upon the future of India, or add quickly to the wealth and comfort of the people. Even a right principle may be robbed of all its value if it is applied to the wrong people. Lord Cornwallis, with the assent of Mr. Pitt, had intended to reform the land revenue of Bengal when he gave the 'permanent settlement,' or, in other words, placed a final limit on the demand

which the State could make on the produce of the soil. But unfortunately when he fixed the rent of the State, he did nothing to regulate the rent of the Ryot. The whole advantage was reaped by the Zemindars, and little or no advance was made in giving that security to the cultivator of the soil, without which his industry is checked, because that industry is never sure of its reward. In later years we had been moving in the right direction. We had been making our settlements more moderate in amount, and above all, longer in duration, the term generally given being thirty years. The Ryots were becoming, as it were, holders of long leases, instead of tenants from year to year. Every step in this direction had been attended with success—a rising revenue, and an improving people. Still, the power which the Government retained of raising its demand indefinitely at the end of the lease or period of settlement, operated to check improvement; and it is notorious that towards the close of the terms it has been the constant practice of the Ryot not only to relax his industry, but purposely to deteriorate the value and productiveness of his land. A system which leads to such results is self-condemned.

But the remedy for this must be as wide as the evil: not a remedy which would apply only here and there to a few English planters or a few wealthy Zemindars. Accordingly, some misgiving as to the partial operation of a power of redemption, had been present to the mind of the Secretary of State in 1859, for his despatch concluded with these words: ‘I particularly request that in any suggestions or recommendations which you may submit to me, you will be especially careful not to confine them to such as may be calculated for the exclusive advantage of European settlers, and which cannot be equally participated in by the agricultural community generally.’ It is fair, however, to Lord Canning’s Government to remember that the only measure actually suggested by the Secretary of State was that the land-tax should be made redeemable. Lord Stanley had indeed observed, with truth, that ‘the permission to redeem the land-tax can operate only, in so far as the people may avail themselves of such permission, as a permanent settlement of the land-tax at its present amount.’ But no means were pointed out whereby the advantages of this permanent settlement could be secured by any except the few who could afford to buy it. A plan of selling the land-tax was accordingly announced by the Indian Government, somewhat hastily, as an adopted measure. Partial as it must have been in its operation, under any circumstances, it was rendered still more partial by its avowedly experimental character, and its limitation to a small proportion

of the land (10 per cent.) in each collectorate. The Home Government has decided, we think well and wisely, to set aside this experiment, and to enter upon a much larger reform — one which goes to the very-root of the whole matter, and inaugurates a new era in the finance of India. Our land settlements are now to be made,—not from year to year, not for a term of years,—but once and for ever. The cultivator of the soil is to be sure that he will reap all the fruits of his own industry, that the demands of the State can never absorb more than a fixed amount of the produce of the soil, and that all he can raise beyond that amount will be his own. We rejoice to see that this great measure has been taken with the cordial assent of a large majority of the Indian Council.* We hear a great deal sometimes of the intricacy of Indian tenures, and of the difference between the ideas of ownership which prevail there and those to which we are accustomed in Europe. But there are some principles which are of universal application, because they rest on the nature of man, and can never cease to operate on the Wealth of Nations. One of these is the close connexion which obtains between the progress of industry and the certainty of enjoying its results. This is one principle which tells in favour of a 'permanent settlement;' and there is another which tells not less decisively against the only objection which is ever raised. The State, it is sometimes said, sacrifices by a permanent settlement its interest in the natural increase of the value of the soil. But the wealth of a Government, if it is such as deserves the name, lies in the wealth of its people. The notion of its having a separate interest of its own is a barbarous and Oriental notion. Nothing is lost, but much is gained when a Government yields to its people that which will stimulate their industry, and tend to the accumulation of their wealth.

But by the time this decision had been taken, Lord Canning's career was closed. Long before he left India the relation in which his character had stood to the memorable events of 1857 came to be universally recognised by a grateful country. How often, in the lives of remarkable men, are we tempted to wish that such recognitions had been yielded sooner! But if the rarer virtues received always, and at once, the homage of the multitude, those virtues would themselves be less. The power of resisting passion is the power of resisting that which carries

* The dissents of the minority, together with an admirable paper by Sir John Lawrence, in favour of the measure, have been presented to Parliament (July 21, 1862), and afford an excellent view of the whole question.

before it other men. They cannot see it as it is, till their own vision has been cleared, and the balance of their mind restored. Enough if they see it then, and are eager to thank the man whose character is greater than their own. When Lord Canning landed in England there is no honour which he might not have had at the public hands. The modesty of his disposition would, probably, have led him to avoid such honours at any time. But besides this, his health was broken by work, by climate, and by severe affliction. Within a few weeks of his arrival, the grave of an illustrious father was opened to receive the body of an illustrious son. His funeral was attended by a large number of the men most distinguished in public life, both of this generation and of that which is nearly gone. There were there colleagues of the elder Canning, who had seen with pleasure and with curious surprise, the very different but not less valuable qualities which replaced in his son the brilliancy and genius of their own early friend. There were there some who had known Lord Canning chiefly as the close political follower of Lord Aberdeen, and who recognised in the temper of his mind the same spirit,—rebellious against all forms of popular injustice. There were there many of Lord Canning's companions in school and college life, to whom his now great reputation was no surprise, because they had long known how safe it was to trust his sagacity and his manly judgment. There were there others who, with no mixture of personal feeling, represented only the universal sorrow of the Sovereign and the People. That sorrow came from the public heart, and was the deeper because it touched, also, the public conscience. All men felt that Westminster Abbey was receiving that day, under its venerable pavement, the remains of one who had done much to restore, and—better still—to justify, our dominion in the East: who, at a time when it was sadly needed, had exhibited to India and the world some of the finest virtues of the English character, and in doing so had shed new lustre on the English name.

- ART. VII.—1. *Testimonies to the Divine Authority and Inspiration of the Holy Scripture, as taught by the Church of England.* By Dr. M'CAUL. London: 1862.
2. *The Inspiration of the Bible.* Five Lectures delivered in Westminster Abbey. By Canon WORDSWORTH. London: 1861.
3. *Inspiration and Interpretation.* By Rev. J. W. BURGON. London: 1861.
4. *The Bible and Modern Thought.* By Rev. T. R. BIRKS, M.A. London: 1862.
5. *The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically Examined.* By J. W. COLENSO, D.D., Bishop of Natal. Part I. London: 1862. Part II., 1863.
6. *An Examination of Bishop Colenso's Difficulties.* By Dr. M'CAUL. London: 1863.
7. *The Historic Character of the Pentateuch Vindicated.* A Reply to Part I. of Bishop Colenso's Critical Examination. By a Layman of the Church of England. 8vo. London: 1863.

ABOUT twenty years ago, a well-known Swiss clergyman, whose opportunities of observation in both countries had been considerable, drew the following comparison between Germany and England:—‘In Germany there is a theology and no church; in England there is a church and no theology.’ For this reflection upon our neglect of those deeper studies, without which the teaching of any church must in no long time become hollow and untrustworthy, there was at that period, no doubt, abundant cause. The Evangelical movement, which had restored spirituality and life to an all but inanimate church, made no pretensions whatever to learning. The heart, and not the intellect, was the lever upon which all its weight had been thrown. The barren age of ‘Evidences’ had, it was hoped, for ever passed away. Study could never lead men to God. Rather it might easily lead them away from Him. And pride of intellect was held to be, of all forms of evil, the most pernicious, the most soul-destructive, amid a world which by its very wisdom (so St. Paul’s language was interpreted) was withheld from the knowledge of God.

But it was not possible that so shallow a religious philosophy as this could long retain its hold upon the educated classes in England. By the end of the third decade of the present century the work of the Evangelical movement had been fairly and

honourably accomplished. Its task was done. Life had been restored to the Church; and she now vigorously roused herself to fulfil anew the functions of life—and especially to exert the power of thought, and resume the forgotten exercise of theological speculation. It soon became apparent, however, that there were two directions in which this newly-awakened energy was likely to find a vent,—directions widely divergent from each other, and whose divergency would, at no distant day, severely strain the utmost powers of coherence which the Church possessed. One class of minds would be led to the study of ecclesiastical antiquity, would re-edit the Fathers, plunge into curious lore about rituals and vestments, and be ultimately attracted towards Rome—the standing representative of the spirit of the Past: the other would be as strongly, though less impetuously, drawn to a study of the new relations that have arisen between theology and modern science, attempting the difficult task of adjusting the symbols and formularies of religion to the modern modes of thought, and attracted towards Germany—the country where the greatest latitude of speculation is allied to the broadest tolerance of opinions.

Nor was it difficult to foresee the form which reawakened thought, following the last-mentioned direction, would ultimately assume. In practical England, the very home and citadel of common sense, a country where the middle class is so predominant that the Government, the press, and even the clergy are compelled, if they will retain their influence, to consult its wishes and re-echo its opinions, and where that middle class has been for centuries leavened with Puritanism and taught to build its whole ideas of the Church and of theology upon the Bible and the Bible only,—there could be little doubt in the mind of any reflecting person that attention and study once again fairly turned upon theology must inevitably end in a formidable controversy, capable (if ill-managed) of shaking, or even rending, the Established Church to its very centre,—a controversy on no less a subject than the true nature and claims of the Bible, on the question (in a word) of ‘Inspiration.’

And to this long-foreseen crisis, it is very evident, we have at last arrived. Twice, in rapid succession—whether wisely or unwisely, it is now too late to inquire—a thrill of excitement has been flashed to the remotest corners of the land, by public and authoritative censures on books of doubtful orthodoxy in this department of theology; until not only every clergyman and religious layman in this country, but even (it appears) the highest representatives of Biblical science on the Continent, are

watching with keen and anxious eyes the issues that hang upon the fair and charitable conduct of the dispute. We have in a former Number of this Review* sufficiently described the origin and early history of this controversy. What we now propose is to cast a glance forward and try to determine its present tendency and its future probable results,—in short, to consider the principal changes that inquiry, earnestly directed to this question, is likely to bring about in the relations hitherto subsisting between the Bible and the Church.

For that some changes must result from the present controversy, we cannot hesitate to express our serious conviction. Progress, in all departments of human thought, seems to be as inevitable as it is desirable; and the laws of progress are in all cases the same. There are successive periods of formation, of fusion, and then of formation again. At one time the plastic power of the imagination, taking up and using the existing data, forms them into a shapely conception, available for the purposes of every-day life, and passing current from hand to hand for months, or years, or even centuries. But meantime another power is also at work. Reason is not asleep; but is busily gathering fresh materials and new data,—many of them incompatible with and destructive of the old. A fresh effort of conception thus in time becomes necessary. The new living matter must be assimilated; the old dead matter must be cast out: or the penalty is ossification of some vital structure, and death.

Now in the case before us, there is no denying that a popular conception of the Bible, sufficient and useful for all practical purposes, has prevailed in England undisturbed for many generations. If assailed (as it has been from Lord Herbert of Cherbury, in the middle of the seventeenth century, downwards), it has always hitherto been assailed by those who made no pretensions to be Christians at all. The question, therefore, of the Bible became merged in the general question of Christianity itself; and no room or leisure was left for distinguishing between different theories of inspiration, when the very existence of any such thing as inspiration was wholly denied. But the time has now come when, not by infidels but by sincere and earnest believers in Christ and His gospel, the popular theories about the Bible are being called in question. By such men it is (and the fact is full of the deepest significance), not by sceptics and scoffers, that the demand is now made that the precise *meaning* of our jealously-guarded expression, 'The

* Edinburgh Review, April, 1860.

‘Inspiration of the Scriptures,’ should receive a candid and reverential examination.

‘Such a work,’ writes Dr. Colenso, ‘must be taken in hand, not in a light and scoffing spirit, but in that of a devout and living faith, which seeks only Truth, and follows fearlessly its footsteps,—as by those who would be able to give an account of the hope that is in them, and to know that the grounds are sure on which they rest their trust for time and for eternity.’*

‘It is perhaps the greatest difficulty of all,’ says Professor Jowett†, ‘to enter into the meaning of the words of Christ,—so gentle, so human, so divine. The interpreter needs nothing short of fashioning in himself the image of the mind of Christ.’ And again‡:—‘To the poor and uneducated, at times to all, no better advice can be given for the understanding of Scripture than to read the Bible humbly with prayer.’

These are not the words, this is not the spirit, of the atheist, the infidel, the sceptic. The one writer may have pressed a narrow line of argument to extreme conclusions, which, in our opinion, it fails to support—the other may appear to float in a region of ill-defined speculations, which lead him to no definitive conclusions at all—yet it is perfectly impossible for any man of ordinary candour to rise from the perusal of their books with an unmitigated condemnation on his lips. For, after all, it is not only the new school which demands that ‘the meaning of Inspiration’ should not be ‘passed over in silence, from a fear of stirring the difficulties that would arise about it.’§ An honest and critical examination is quite as loudly called for by men of a very different stamp. ‘We desiderate nothing,’ says Mr. Burgon||, ‘so much as “searching inquiry.” From such “free handling” the cause of sacred Truth can never suffer.’ ‘My earnest wish is,’ says Bishop Fitzgerald¶, ‘that those who think they can speak would speak out and let us know the worst.’ ‘Criticism must be met by criticism,’ writes Dr. McCaul**, ‘learning by learning, science by science.’ ‘The Church does not reject criticism,’ says Dr. Hengstenberg††, ‘but wishes for it and tends it and cherishes it,—knowing that

* On the Pentateuch, part i. p. 15.

† Essays and Reviews, p. 380.

‡ On Romans, &c., ii. 99.

§ Essays, &c., p. 344.

|| On Inspiration, p. xxxvi.

¶ Aids to Faith, p. 77.

** Three Letters on Rationalism, p. 29.

†† In the ‘Evang. Kirchen-Zeitung,’ quoted in the ‘Guardian,’ Mar. 26th, 1862.

'in it she finds, not destruction, but preservation of her noblest 'possessions.' All these writers with one accord demand free and unfettered inquiry; all being evidently full of confidence that no amount of inquiry can possibly shake that established popular view of the Bible in which they themselves honestly believe. Let us see if the facts are such as to warrant this confidence.

And first of all, what is precisely the popular view about the Bible? It appears to be this: that the Bible not only contains, but actually is, 'the Word of God;' that its composition was, if not dictated, yet so far superintended by Almighty God as to guarantee it against the admixture of any kind of error, and to constitute it, now that miracles and prophecy have ceased, His voice and representative upon earth; that every text, therefore, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation, speaks directly from Him to every individual man; and that, while theology is fully authorised to pile up upon the basis of the letter of Scripture any amount of arbitrary interpretation, fanciful typology and farfetched application, yet if it but threaten in the most distant way to disturb that basis or to undermine by its criticism the accepted dogma about the sacred text, it instantly becomes impious, is to be suspected of as deadly intentions as 'a loaded shell,' and must be cast forth with anathema by all who value the safety of their immortal souls, or would protect the purity of their Church's creed.

'The Bible is none other than the voice of Him that sitteth upon the Throne. Every book of it — every chapter of it — every verse of it — every word of it — every syllable of it — (where are we to stop?) every letter of it — is the direct utterance of the Most High.* 'Behind the human authors stood the Divine Spirit, controlling, guiding, and suggesting every part of their different messages.† 'All is alike inspired. Every chapter, and verse, and word, is from God.‡ 'Notoriety is sought by setting aside the plenary authority of God's Word, that is, the authority of the Holy Ghost, whose record it is.'§

And yet what strange shifts and unexpected concessions men of undoubted orthodoxy on the subject of Inspiration are led into by the necessities of a false position! Some go far towards

* Burgon on Inspiration, p. 89.

† Birks, 'The Bible and Modern Thought,' p. 438.

‡ Ryle's Tracts, No. xii.

§ Tregelles, 'Introduction to New Testament,' p. 448.

establishing themselves on the ground so long strenuously contended for by Professor F. Newman and his school, that after all there can be no such thing as the Inspiration of a Book: thus Mr. Swainson ('*Authority of New Testament*,' p. 96.) writes, 'Infallibility cannot be predicated of a book.' 'The message of God to the world,' says Dr. Vaughan, ('*Personality of the Tempter*,' p. 163.), 'is a Word, and not 'a Book;' and Canon Browne's words ('*Aids to Faith*,' p. 308.) seem to indicate the same thought:—'If God spoke, it is plain, 'that he spoke through man; if God inspired, He inspired man.' Others approach perilously near to self-contradiction. Professor Rawlinson (in his '*Bampton Lectures*,' p. 77.) speaks of the Pentateuch as 'a history absolutely and in every respect true;' and yet in the same breath allows the existence of 'occasionally 'accidental corruptions of the text—a few interpolations—'glosses which have crept in from the margin.' Mr. Lee ('*On Inspiration*,' pp. iv. and 13.), after repudiating the theories of a 'mechanical' Inspiration, yet ends by making the Bible 'Divine,' 'perfect,' and 'infallible' (p. iv.), 'of indisputable authority, 'perfect and entire truthfulness in all and every part' (p. 19.), the writers 'prompted to the task,' the 'materials selected,' the whole 'moulded into unity' by the Holy Spirit (p. 31.), and the very 'language not left to the unaided choice of the 'various writers' (p. 32.). Others are driven to admit the inspiration of the LXX.; thus, for instance, Dean Alford writes:—'As Christian believers, our course is plain. How the 'word came into the LXX. we cannot say; but, being 'there, it is now sanctioned for us by the citation here; not as 'the, or even a proper rendering of the Hebrew, but as a prophetic utterance equivalent to and representing that other.*' And so Dr. Mill: 'In these instances we may often discern a 'moral meaning, either identical with that of the original text, 'or a fuller developement of it, brought out by the same Spirit 'who spoke by the Prophets, and who more intimately hallowed 'the Apostles of the New Dispensation; and sometimes what 'might even be thought the mistake of the old translators seems 'overruled for the same purpose.'† And yet the same Dean Alford, on 1 Thessalonians, iv. 15., holds that St. Paul was mistaken about the nearness of the Second Advent. The same Mr. Birks whom we have quoted above allows that 'the inspiration and authority of the Bible are not synonymous with

* On Hebrews x. 5.

† On Mythical Interpretation, p. 175

‘entire freedom from the intrusion of the slightest error.’* One of the writers in ‘*Replies to Essays and Reviews*’ exclaims against his antagonist for questioning the application of Hosea xi. 1. by St. Matthew, ‘the essayist correcting the Holy Ghost!’† while another in the same volume entitles the Mosaic account of creation a ‘Psalm of the Almighty’s handiwork,’‡, in language almost identical with that of Theodore Parker in his ‘*Discourses of Religion*’ (p. 278.). Lastly, to quote two works emanating from the Evangelical School: Mr. Fisher conceives the all-important question of the Canon of Scripture to have been settled, ‘so far as human instrumentality can be supposed in such a case to have been really available, through the secret agency of those “hidden ones” whom God has in every age preserved as a people to Himself:’§ while Messrs. Webster and Wilkinson, in the Introduction to their ‘*Greek Testament*,’ p. xlv., thus clear the way for our reception of the Inspired Volume:—‘It will be understood that an Inspiration which may be truly characterised as direct, personal, independent, plenary,—is consistent with the use of an inferior or provincial dialect, with ignorance of scientific facts and other secular matters, with mistakes in historical allusions or references, and mistakes in conduct, and with circumstantial discrepancies between inspired persons in relating discourses, conversations, or events.’ We draw a long breath, and wonder where we are; whether in Germany or England; whether at the feet of orthodoxy or heterodoxy, or of both in some way inextricably combined; and, after much study of the subject, are reluctantly compelled to endorse Cardinal Wiseman’s statement, ‘That, having perused with great attention all that has fallen in my way from Protestant writers on this subject, I have hardly found one single argument advanced by them that is not logically incorrect.’||

Now it appears to us there is but one safe and honest method of escape from this labyrinth of confusion and contradiction: and that is, the bold and manly course indicated alike by Mr. Burgon and by his antagonist, Professor Jowett — viz., to go to the Bible itself, and by patient, faithful scrutiny endeavour to discover what are the actual *facts* of the case. Surely it cannot be impossible, bringing as a preliminary condition, the highest and most reverential conception that can be formed of

* *The Bible and Modern Thought*, p. 208.

† *Replies*, p. 484.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 337.

§ *Liturgical Purity*, p. 447.

|| *Lectures on the Catholic Church*, Lect. ii. p. 37.

these sacred and inspired writings, to eliminate from that conception all that is inconsistent with patent facts,—and so by humbly and reverently submitting to learn from Almighty God what it has pleased Him that the Bible should *be*, instead of learning from fallible men what it pleases them to think the Bible *ought* to be, to make at least some few steps towards the actual truth of the matter. The prosecution of this method in detail we must of course leave to those who have the leisure and ability to pursue it, contenting ourselves in the present article with setting before the reader a very brief and unpretending specimen of the kind of argument which we wish to suggest.*

Starting then with the assumption, the truth of which is repeatedly urged and inculcated by every writer of every school outside the pale of Rome—and sometimes even by those within that pale—viz., that inquiry into the facts relating to Holy Scripture is permissible, and if permissible, a positive and bounden duty,—the first phenomenon which meets the inquirer and demands his attention, is that of *Various Readings*.

It is believed that in the Old Testament alone there are about 30,000 various readings, and in the New Testament a number almost surpassing computation,—as anyone may see for himself by taking the trouble to open Tischendorf's latest critical edition of the Greek Testament: the truth being, as Dr. Tregelles has well put it, that 'it is *impossible* (unless 'human infirmity were overruled by a miracle) for a writing to 'be copied again and again without the introduction of some 'errors of transcription.† On the first discovery of this fact

* It lies not within the scope of this article, or indeed of this Journal, to enter upon questions of Biblical exegesis; and the strict critical discussion of Dr. Colenso's statements and arguments appears to us properly to devolve on our theological contemporaries. To be complete such an inquiry would demand far more space than we can give to it. But as far as the question of historic evidence is concerned, the work which stands last on the list heading this article ('The Historic Character of the Pentateuch Vindicated,' by a Layman of the Church of England), leaves little to be desired. It is perfectly dispassionate in tone. It replaces the declamatory strain of theological controversialists by the precision of a layman, apparently accustomed to weigh evidence. It appeals entirely to the direct evidence of the Pentateuch itself, interpreted by common sense. And with these fair and lawful weapons it effectually disposes of the greater part of Dr. Colenso's objections. We know absolutely nothing of the author of this remarkable volume; but it is by far the ablest book on the subject which has come under our notice.

† On the Printed Text of the New Testament, p. 37.

great was the alarm. Bishop Standish of St. Asaph, at Paul's Cross, called on the Lord Mayor of London to interfere, and not suffer such novelties to subvert the authority of Holy Scripture. Even two centuries later, the excellent Bengel was urged by an opponent to admit that the various readings were themselves given by Divine inspiration, in order to meet the wants of various readers. But in spite of these obstructions, textual criticism held on its way; and the result may be given in the words of Baron Bunsen:—'Bold criticism has given us 'a *sure* text, not the reverse. It began with 30,000 various 'readings: it has reduced them to 137; of which 32 are of 'equal value with our present text,—105 of less value,—and 'not one is important for any doctrinal purpose.*' Thus, to use his own words, 'Mankind has found that an earnest, conscientious use of reason ultimately corroborates faith.' Yet still, the truth is perfectly obvious,—that whatever else *inspiration* may signify, it does not include the idea of a divinely guaranteed text.

It at once appears, therefore, that any definition of the word which involves the dogma of a verbal, literal, superintendence cannot be maintained; or can only be maintained under the extraordinary conditions supposed by Mr. Birks,—viz., that while each original autograph as it successively appeared was thus absolutely perfect, yet perishing rapidly—the first even before the last was completed.—'A Bible gifted with 'this ideal perfection has never been in the hands of any human 'being.' Such an hypothesis will not, we are persuaded, commend itself to any unprejudiced mind. And if not, one element of error is, it seems, already eliminated from the popular view of biblical inspiration. Theory is at the outset circumscribed by fact, and the flights of fancy curbed by the processes of reason; the result being that the merely imaginary and artificial perfection of a text miraculously guarded from all change is replaced by a far healthier and nobler conception. The Book, it is found, has been left to mere human loyalty to guard, and to human industry to clear from accretions; and the issue is a firmer faith in man's fidelity and a calmer trust in God's wisdom.

But to proceed with our inquiry. The next phenomenon which strikes the honest student of Scripture is, that there are *contradictions* there,—statements, some of which cannot possibly be reconciled with each other, and many more which, though

* Bibelwerk, p. xlvii.

said to be reconciled, yet remain to the natural eye of common sense unresolved discrepancies. They may be concerned with comparatively trifling subjects: but still, contradictions they are. For instance—Numbers iii. 39. mentions the whole number of Levites as 22,000; while the distinct enumeration of the three Levitical families in the same chapter gives a different computation. 2 Chron. xvi. 1. relates that in ‘The six-and-thirtieth year of the reign of Asa, Baasha, King of Israel, came up against Judah.’ But in 1 Kings xv. 33. it appears that Baasha had died in the twenty-seventh year of Asa’s reign. Again, 2 Chron. xxxii. 2. makes Ahaziah forty-two years old when his father dies; but xxxi. 20. relates that the father himself was but forty years old when he died. Lastly, 2 Chron. xxiv. 14. relates that ‘Spoons and vessels of gold and silver’ were made of the surplus money collected by Johoiada: while 2 Kings xii. 13. states distinctly, ‘There were not made . . . any vessels of gold or of silver, of the money that was brought into the house of the Lord.’ These specimens, taken from the Old Testament alone, will suffice. They are but trifling matters; they are but the veriest specks and motes floating in the sunbeams of divine truth: but still they are facts,—and facts which, however small, are enough to prove that *inspiration*, whatever else it means, does not mean a divine guarantee of an infallibly consistent statement of numbers or events.

But we cannot stop here. The farther question immediately suggests itself—‘Are there, as a fact, any passages in the Bible which are at variance with the known truths of science?’ For, to use the words of Dean Goodwin, ‘Divine inspiration *may* imply an absence of errors upon physical questions, or it may not: who shall venture to say *a priori* whether it does or no? . . . Why not endeavour, by looking at the evidence, to see on which side the truth lies? And if it should appear, upon examination, that any chapter contains statements not in accordance with science, then, instead of coming to the conclusion that the Scriptures are not inspired, I should rather come to this, viz., that the idea of inspiration does not involve that accuracy concerning physics which many persons have imagined that it does.*’ By way of specimen, it may suffice to adduce the insuperable difficulties that all non-theological geologists have found in the idea of an universal deluge: and to refer the reader to two remarkable letters from the professor

* Hulsean Lectures, 1855, p. 101.

of geology and the 'Radcliffe Observer' at Oxford which were appended to the 'Replies to Essays and Reviews.' Mr. Main there absolutely scouts the idea of creation in six days; and Professor Philipps prudentially confesses, 'We do not seek our 'geology in the Bible.' We are brought then to this further result, that *inspiration*, whatever else it means, does not mean infallible scientific accuracy.

Advancing yet further, we next demand, 'What is the *literary* 'character of this singularly venerable, yet clearly not infallible, volume?' Are all the parts of it divinely guaranteed as belonging to the age, and written by the persons, to which they are popularly attributed? And here we meet with the following phenomena:—The Pentateuch is attributed to Moses: but it contains an account of his own death, and an allusion to the kings of Israel.* Isaiah presents every indication of a change of writers at Chapter xl., and the subsequent chapters are, in the opinion of many first-rate scholars—such as Gesenius, De Wette, Knobel, Ewald,—the work of a later hand. The Book of Daniel is placed in the Hebrew Bible among the later Hagiographa, and has other strong indications of being composed as late as the Maccabean times. The prophecy of Zechariah is divided, even by Mr. Davison (on Prophecy, p. 230.), into two parts; of which the latter, from chapter ix. to end, he thinks, 'cannot well be ascribed to Zechariah or 'his age.' Ecclesiastes is by almost all modern critics attributed to a writer many centuries later than Solomon. The Book of Enoch, quoted by S. Jude, has actually been found; and is a late pseudonymous production. Add to this the remark of Dr. Donaldson,—no mean authority,—that the Hebrew of the Old Testament 'is, with trifling exceptions, 'one and uniform; and there is no trace of those archaisms by 'which the ancient writer is invariably distinguished from 'those who wrote the same language many centuries later,†—and we find ourselves brought to the conclusion that *inspiration*, whatever else it mean, does not mean a positively certain guarantee of literary genuineness.

This method of inquiry,—which we have here simply indicated,—might of course be carried out to any conceivable length; and we can imagine nothing more useful than a book which should honestly and patiently undertake a thorough examination of the facts of the case, down to the minutest details. What has been said, however, is enough to suggest what

* Deut. xxxiv. 5., and Gen. xxxvi. 31.

† Christian Orthodoxy, p. 161.

will, in all probability, be the results, on the negative and destructive side, of the pending investigations on this subject; and it only remains now to attempt the positive and happier task of construction; and to inquire 'What then exactly are we to understand, when the Scriptures are spoken of as "inspired?"'

There remain these striking and undeniable facts:—First, that this Book, with its singular and complex contents, has commanded the earnest attention and devoted veneration of the best, the most earnest, the most devoted men of every successive generation for 1,800 years. It has been despised by an impure-minded Gibbon, a vain and licentious Voltaire, a coarse and blasphemous Tom Paine. It has been treasured and consulted as the very Word of God Himself by countless men of pure and noble lives, in Church and State, in public and private life, of every shade of opinion and every type of mind. Such facts indicate that there must be, at least, something in the book attractive to the high-minded and pure,—something responsive to their instincts and cravings,—something above them and from which they can draw yet higher supplies of material for religious thought and incitement to religious practice. Whatever men may mean by calling the Book 'inspired,' they find it to be at any rate 'inspir-ing,'—fruitful of the highest thoughts, pregnant of the purest faith, suggestive of the loftiest self-denial.

Next we remark that this wonderful Book has formed for ages the solid kernel and backbone of that system of religious theory which the highest and most cultivated intellects uniformly recognise as the only absolutely true one, viz. Monotheism. Judaism, Christianity, Mahometanism—the three monotheistic religions of the world—all point to the Bible as their nucleus. To lose one's hold of it seems always to involve going utterly adrift into endless speculations, becoming lost in a sea of perplexity, and falling back at last on Nature and her revelations of God, which of themselves have generally sunk men instead of elevating them, by presenting the physical instead of the moral attributes of God for their adoration.*

Lastly, we notice that this Book, gradually formed *within* the Church during her earlier ages—just as the bony structure is formed during youth within the living animal, and as a consequence of its life—has proved itself invaluable to both the Jewish and Christian communities alike, by preserving the record of their early religious history, and so supplying a

* 'The principles of reason as applied to nature do not conduct to any theological truths.' (*Kant, Critic of pure Reason*, p. 390.)

test to which all later accretions and impurities may be brought for reformation. To what extravagant aberrations of doctrine and practice the Christian Church might have arrived in eighteen centuries without any such fixed standard, may perhaps be guessed by observing what has resulted in the Roman Church from simply keeping that standard in the background.

Now from these positive and negative facts combined, surely the following results are absolutely inevitable: first of all, that it does not by any means follow, because a book is inspired by Almighty God, that it should therefore be *faultless*, or (to use Dr. Arnold's expression) that He should have communicated to it His own divine perfections.* The most highly inspired men, such as St. Peter, were liable to serious error. Churches and councils to whom we believe the Divine Presence to have been in a special manner vouchsafed, 'may err and have erred, even 'in matters pertaining to Faith.' Nay, in Nature herself, where no one can deny the finger of God, imperfection, waste, self-imposed limitation as to variety of type and selection of materials, are obviously consistent with, and to some minds indicative of, the presence and agency of a Divine wisdom.† Why may it not be so with the Bible? Why may it not be true, — and, if so, why should it not be recognised, — that this Book presents the same characteristics which the best and highest of God's other gifts present, viz.: not the mere outward symmetry of a finite and mechanical perfection, but the inward, elastic and reproductive power of a divine Life?

Secondly, it is obvious that the Inspiration, the Divine Spirit, which breathes through this Book is — not of a scientific, critical, or historical character — but a distinctly and exclusively religious spirit; that it is in *this* respect that the Gospel is in advance of every succeeding age; that it is to enjoy *this* effluence from its loved and treasured pages that the pure and good in every generation sit as learners at its feet. If we would but remember this, we should escape a host of difficulties; we should thankfully accept the water of life, although presented to us in earthen vessels; and we should certainly never allow ourselves, as some good men have done, to exclaim in peevish disappointment, 'We will not be ministered to by a book which is not in all 'points perfect and infallible as Almighty God himself.'

Lastly, we conclude that the epithets properly to be applied to the Bible are these, and not more than these: viz., that it is

* Sermons, vol. iv., quoted in Prof. Stanley's 'The Bible, its Form and Substance,' p. viii.

† E. g. Ruskin, 'Seven Lamps of Architecture,' p. 40.

INSPIRED,—replete itself, and pregnant without stint for him that rightly uses it, with that spirit of purity, faith, obedience, charity, which forms the essential temper and characteristic of the Church and family of God:—that it is SACRED,—set by itself, a book apart, fenced from all levity, irreverence, and mere curious handling; a book worthy, if only for what it has effected in the world, of all possible respect and honour; and regarded with too great awe and love by multitudes of the tenderest, most heavenly, and sensitive minds for anyone possessed of the commonest sympathy or charity to approach it with the shoes of every-day profanity upon his feet:—and once more, that it is CANONICAL,—or, in other words, that collection of writings which amid the multitude of claimants the Church has ‘canonised,’ has deliberately and after examination given her sanction to, as her authorised volume of appeal and instruction, —and which so, by a natural transition of meaning, has become her Canon, her rule of faith, her standard whereby to test the accordance of men and doctrines with the Spirit that is in her and with that ‘mould of doctrine’ into which the first Apostolic churches were cast.

And why, it may be asked, should we go farther than this? Why should we be striving and wrestling against inevitable facts, in order to extort a higher—nay, rather an infinitely lower, more unnatural, more mechanical, dead, inelastic,—notion of Inspiration out of data which positively refuse to lend themselves to such a purpose? Why should we blind ourselves to the fact, that Germans even of the most Evangelical and orthodox school of Lutheranism*, and Russians of the most intelligent and reforming school in the Greek Church†, —not to speak of Romanists‡—reproach and ridicule our English Protestantism for its unintelligent literalism and slavish idolatry of the Bible? Why should it continue to be thought more reverent, more safe, and more religious,—why should it not rather be thought more puerile and superstitious,—obstinately to cling to the rude rough-hewn popular notion of Inspiration, instead of accepting and allowing to percolate into the lower strata of thought and cultivation that more subtle, more free, and more spiritual conception of what makes the Bible God’s Word to man, which the facts educed by modern inquiry show to be the true one? Why should we (in short) be so enamoured of our own pre-

* E. g. Tholuck, ‘Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen,’ p. 151.

† Quelques Mots sur les Communions Occidentales, p. 17.

‡ E. g. Wiseman, Lect. ii. p. 39. ‘There is some reason to fear that such image-worship is far from uncommon in this country.’

conceived theories, as to refuse to raise ourselves to the far grander conception of a book of God truly and veritably *human* in its structure, its contents, its transmission, as well as replete with the Divine Spirit which (as far as we know) deigns only to breathe into man's world through the instrumentality of 'very Man,'* — a refusal which recalls the self-willed conduct of the Pharisees of old, who would not receive the incarnate Word, when He came in the lowly form of a real tangible man like other men, simply because they were preoccupied with an *à priori* conception of their own as to what the Messiah *ought* to be.

In one word, after all, lies the gist of the whole matter. Whatever is *true* must be the safest and best to 'hold fast to.' Whatever is based upon facts must be sounder than what is based upon theories,—be the facts never so difficult, or the theories never so easy. 'It is the highest wisdom,' says Dr. Newman, 'to accept truth of whatever kind, whenever it is clearly ascertained to be such; though there may be difficulty in adjusting it with other known truths.†' While 'to conceal and gloss over wounds and weak places that may have been discovered in the fundamentals of our faith is worse than useless; inasmuch as hidden sores are always the most dangerous.‡'

'Whatsoever is spoken of God, or of things pertaining to God otherwise than as the truth is, though it seem an honour, it is an injury. And as incredible praises given unto men do often abate and impair the credit of their deserved commendation, so we must likewise take heed lest, in attributing unto Scripture more than it can have, the incredibility of that do cause even those things which indeed it hath most abundantly to be less reverently esteemed.' So wrote Richard Hooker, at the end of his Second Book of Ecclesiastical Polity.

But in a far severer strain wrote a great layman of the same age:—'You may find all access to any philosophy, however pure, intercepted by the ignorance of devices. . . . And, in the habits and regulations of schools, universities, and the like assemblies destined for the abode of learned men and the improvement of learning, everything is found to be opposed to the progress of the sciences.'§ And

* The analogy here suggested has occurred to many thoughtful persons of late. See especially Swainson, p. 144.

† University Addresses, p. 271.

‡ Lücke on St. John, p. x.

§ Bacon, Nov. Org., p. 72.

in scarcely less forcible words, that Prince of English Theologians, in the succeeding century, Bishop Jeremy Taylor: 'The pretence of a necessity of humbling the understanding is none of the meanest arts whereby some persons have invaded and usurped a power over men's faith and conscience. . . . He that submits his understanding to all that he knows God hath said, and is ready to submit to all that He hath said if he did but know it, this man hath brought his understanding into subjection, and every proud thought unto the obedience of Christ.*

Such warnings are not, even at the present day, wholly uncalled for. And with regard to the special subject with which this article is concerned, we cannot refrain from recording, in conclusion, our most earnest conviction that nothing can be more fatal to the cause which it is desired to maintain, nothing can more certainly undermine the soundness and destroy the vigour of our English Theology, than the rash and strangely self-confident attempts which have lately been made to interfere with the natural and inevitable course of speculation upon these subjects, by the introduction of every sort of disturbing influence from without that could be devised. 'Freedom of inquiry' is an essential principle of Protestantism; and in the sceptical struggle after truth, there may be often more of the Christian spirit than in an unhesitating traditional belief.† So wrote Dr. Pusey in a work now, we believe, withdrawn from circulation. But we venture to think that (whether withdrawn or not) living illustrations of the truth of these remarks would not be far to seek. It appears to argue little short of infatuation for learned men to suppose that the interests of the unlearned can best be consulted by staving off, instead of discussing, the difficult questions of the day,—or to think that in the freest country of Christendom the power of religion will be increased by ecclesiastical discouragements to free inquiry. And what need can possibly exist for such discouragement? Will the truth of Christianity perish,—will the fact of Revelation come to an end,—if the Pentateuch be composed by two authors instead of one, or the Chronicles be at variance about a genealogy with the Book of Kings? 'What,' says a living writer belonging to a church which we are too apt to regard as the type of everything backward, petrified, and dead,—the Greek Communion,—

* *Liberty of Prophesying*, p. 42.

† *On German Rationalism*, pp. 140. 176.

‘What if such a verse be an interpolation—what if the Pentateuch contain Chaldaisms which indicate a remodelling or editing hand later than the times of Moses,—what if such or such a fact have become distorted by tradition or some other been clothed in the forms of Myth,—or what if the peculiar Semitic character have given sometimes a mysterious colouring to events that lay really in the natural order of things,—what of all this? Will all these criticisms, these analyses, this removal of parasitical and foreign accretions, cause that the living and organic Fact, on which they grew, shall not have been? Will they be able to reverse the fact that the Jewish people, alone in the world, have preserved the doctrines of the unity of God and of the future destiny of mankind,—that the heroes, seers, and sages of Israel have by word and deed maintained this doctrine, amid the grossest surrounding idolatries, the most overpowering misfortunes, the gravest temptations, the most adverse circumstances? Can they prevent us from feeling, to the very bottom of our hearts and the centre of our being, that it is owing to the tenacious conservatism of the Jewish law that we, branches of the wild olive-tree, have been able to be grafted into the good olive-tree of God, and made partakers in its root and fatness,—that is, in the knowledge and worship of our Creator? But it is necessary to be alive, in order to comprehend life.*

Yes, it is necessary to be alive,—it is necessary to be able to feel how much greater is the Gospel than the record which contains the gospel, how much nobler is the spirit of Christianity than the letter which merely inculcates that spirit, how much grander is the Christian Church—built up of living men—than any mere organs or material instruments which it may be permitted to employ,—ere we can hope to understand the true relations between the Bible and the Church, or learn to acquiesce with faith and patience in changes which may seem for the moment to threaten our peace and rob us of our consolation, but which in reality only withdraw with one hand what they restore in tenfold worth and glory with the other. Who does not now feel that the science of Astronomy, once so dreaded, has enabled him with deeper emotions of awe and self-abasement to use those Psalms that speak of God’s glory in the firmament? And are not these words as true as they are beautiful and consoling:—

‘The oldest and the youngest of the natural sciences, astronomy and geology, so far from being dangerous to the notion of a Universal Mind, are particularly calculated to lead back the wandering intellect to religious emotions; they spontaneously assume the dignity of sacred sciences; the student rises from them hallowed and elevated;

* Quelques Mots sur les Communions Occidentales, par un Chrétien Orthodoxe, p. 67.

they seem indeed providentially destined to engage the present century so powerfully, that the ideal majesty of infinite time and endless space might counteract that low and narrow materialism which threatens to bury all the sublimest aspirations of our divine nature in the common gulf of selfishness and worldliness.*

And why may we not hope that similar happy results will issue from a faithful prosecution of that study which is now the subject of so much obloquy,—historical criticism? For it is not the *fact* of a Revelation which is now in question, but the nature and the method of it. It is not the *fact* of Inspiration which is under discussion, but the meaning and the extent of it. Whatever may be the inaccuracies and imperfections of the ancient records of the faith, which have descended to us subject to the usual conditions of human tradition, no one who has for himself seized their pervading spirit, no one who has marked their visible effects upon the religious and temporal condition of mankind, can fail to recognise enshrined there something which immeasurably transcends all the productions of the unaided human intellect, something which the human mind certainly did not create and does not yet, after centuries of study, fully comprehend.

It is therefore nothing short of a faithless timidity which seeks to secure this apparently tottering Ark of God by the rash employment of whatever profane and secular expedients come first to hand. It is not prudence but cowardice which would encumber an already strong position with weak and useless entrenchments, certain to fall at the first serious attack and to be turned against the cause they should support. The Bible, we may rest assured, if it is in any sense the Book of God, will be well able to resist all merely sceptical assaults that may be made upon it. The faith of Abraham that 'in his seed all nations of the earth should be blessed' has not, as a fact, been disappointed. The announcement of the Pentateuch that a prophet should hereafter arise, as a second and a greater Moses, has obviously not come to nothing. The triumphant vision of Isaiah, which describes the Gentile world as pressing round the throne of the Jewish Messiah, has not surely been stultified. The prophecy of Jeremiah, that the day would eventually come for a new dispensation, a *καινή Διαθήκη*, of a more spiritual character than the Old, cannot (with the 'New Testament' in our hands) be held to be otherwise than true. But far beyond and above all other testimonies to the essential truth and Divine power that reside in the Jewish and

* Kalisch on Genesis, Introd., p. 43.

Christian Scriptures is the living fact, patent to all eyes, of the Christian Church itself. Here is the Spirit of the Bible embodied and operating upon the world. Here is that spirit which has in a temporal sense regenerated human society, as it has in a mystical sense regenerated human nature, not circumscribed within the pages of a book, but living, acting, and moving, pervading the religious assemblies of faithful men, breathing around an atmosphere of devout aspirations, of good deeds, of faith, of prayer,—forming the life and the light of the world,—not limited in its effects by any form of Church government however abnormal, or of doctrine however extravagant, but fulfilling in the moral world the same functions as the vital principle in the natural world,—the functions of imparting free movement to inert matter, of superseding by the miracle of a higher law the lower and ordinary laws which bind inanimate things, and of withdrawing yet a little farther the mysterious curtain which veils the end and the purposes of God in the maintenance of his creation.

The Bible and the Church then mutually support and bear witness to each other,—the one, as the living agent, thankfully recognising as God's gift what His living Spirit within her has shaped and His providence preserved,—the other, like some vital organism, bearing unconscious testimony to a long foreseen design and revealing the history of a gradually-accomplished plan. Together they must stand or fall: or rather, together they will stand for ever, unshaken by the worst assaults which either scepticism or dogmatism may inflict upon them.

ART. VIII.—1. *The Capital of the Tycoon, a Narrative of a Three Years' Residence in Japan.* By Sir RUTHERFORD ALCOCK, K.C.B., Her Majesty's Minister Plenipotentiary in Japan. Two vols. London: 1863.

2. *Correspondence respecting Affairs in Japan.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament. February: 1863.

IF Lemuel Gulliver had recently returned from a fourth voyage to 'Laputa, Balnibarbi, Luggnagg, Glubbdudrib, 'and Japan,' his narrative would not have been more full of strange incidents and novel observations than these volumes. Indeed, it was by a happy conjecture that Dean Swift ranked Japan with those creations of his own misanthropic genius, where all the conditions of European society were at once reflected, distorted, and inverted. To us the discovery of a college of Laputians, or of a wilderness of Struldbrugs, would not be more amusing or more astonishing than this 'Three Years' Residence in the Capital of the Tycoon; and although we have entire faith in the veracity of Her Majesty's minister at that fantastic court, we are amazed at the (apparently unconscious) touches of satire which the experience of Japanese society suggests to an accomplished European observer. The laws, institutions, and usages of Japan are the caricature of all that has ever been known of brutality and absurdity in the laws, institutions, and usages of mankind. In those favoured islands, what used to be called 'the wisdom of our ancestors' has evidently found a refuge. Every blunder in political economy and finance from the days of Mr. Vansittart to the days of Mr. Disraeli is there dignified with immutable authority. Every privilege which was once conferred on a dominant class of nobles and landowners by the stern exactions and exclusive laws of the feudal system is there armed with a sanguinary power. They have a priesthood as ceremonious and a people as superstitious as in the worst ages of Roman Catholic bigotry; they have statesmen as crafty as Machiavel and as faithless as Borgia; they have chiefs for whose sanguinary ferocity we can find no parallel but on the coast of Dahomey. To these ancient enormities, common to other countries in past ages or to savages in our own, the Japanese add an immense number of peculiarities, entirely of native growth, which make them the most singular and perplexing people on the face of the earth.

If that missing link in the genus 'Man,' which disturbs the system of Professor Darwin and ruffles the mind of Professor

Huxley, were suddenly discovered in one of the islands of the Eastern archipelago — if Sir Charles Lyell were to hit upon a human skull in a geological formation measured by countless ages — those learned anthropologists would attain the same degree of satisfaction which we derive from the most accurate and comprehensive account yet published of the people of Japan. Not only is this book remarkably graphic and amusing, since, with the assistance of a vast number of designs from the works of native artists, it presents a complete picture of the population of Jeddo, and some important notices of the interior of Nipon, but it also contains ample materials for the ruminations of the philosopher and the politician. Japan is a land of paradoxes and problems. Accustomed as we are to carry on intercourse with a great many varieties of the human race, we acknowledge that by far the most curious study is that people with which no intercourse has for centuries been carried on at all. The treaties concluded within the last few years between the Tycoon and several Christian Powers have brought our countrymen into closer contact with these peculiarities and difficulties; but they have in no degree diminished their real intensity. On the contrary, there is reason to fear that they have also brought us to the brink of very serious and painful occurrences. The partial opening of Japan has already led to a multitude of frightful crimes and atrocities, not only in the shape of murders and attempts to murder the foreign interlopers, but in treacherous acts of violence against many of the principal natives. The Tycoon himself and every one of the Japanese ministers who was concerned in the negotiation of Lord Elgin's treaty, has already disappeared from the scene, either by open or secret murder, or by suicide, or by banishment; the Gotairo or regent was slain at the gates of his palace; the British Legation has twice or thrice been attacked with great loss of life; a dozen abominable murders have been committed on the persons of Russian, American, and British residents; extraordinary social and political changes have been taking place in Jeddo; signal reparation has at length been demanded by the British Government, as we learn from the last papers submitted to Parliament; and we are evidently approaching a crisis of great moment in our relations with this strange people, from which we scarcely hope to escape without hostilities.

The publication of such a work at the present time is therefore of national interest. Sir Rutherford Alcock, in his capacity of a diplomatic agent, has, of course, abstained from saying anything which might embarrass the action of the British Government, or disclose the particular measures

it may be led to adopt. In dealing with the political questions that arise he rests his arguments entirely on facts already publicly communicated to Parliament. But he discusses the general principles of policy which must regulate our conduct in these delicate transactions in a very laudable spirit of freedom and independence. It is no doubt highly desirable that the nation should have the best means that can be obtained for forming a judgment on these transactions. Is our present position in Japan tenable? Can we maintain, or improve that position without the use of force? Are we justified in the use of force against a people, guilty to us of no other crime than that of resenting as an intolerable nuisance the intrusion of foreigners on its soil? If we are morally justified in the use of force, are our interests in Japan, present and future, of sufficient magnitude to cover the risk of war? Are there any other political reasons which compel us at all hazards to hold the position we have assumed? These are very serious and difficult questions; and although Sir Rutherford Alcock does not pretend to answer them dogmatically, he certainly places them in a new and interesting light before his readers. His style is a little diffuse — perhaps a little ambitious: but it is gay, lively, and descriptive; and the observations he has introduced on the singular social phenomena before his eyes (for the book was chiefly written, as we understand, at Jeddo), denote a cultivated mind, an acute judgment, and a wide acquaintance with men and books.

But even if this narrative had far less merit than it undoubtedly possesses, it would excite our highest interest from the extraordinary circumstances in which the author was placed. Sir Rutherford Alcock was sent to Japan as the first regular diplomatic agent after the conclusion of the Treaty with England. Lord Elgin's brief and successful mission had left a pleasing but fallacious impression on the minds of the British negotiators. But it soon became manifest that every concession made on paper must be fought for and won step by step, when it came to actual performance. The Japanese Government, or at least the Government of the Tycoon (which is not the same thing), had nominally granted access to certain ports; but the organic law which excludes foreigners from Japan had not been abrogated and is still in force; that law, moreover, is in accordance with the supposed interests and the undoubted passions of the dominant class. It soon appeared that the insincerity of the Japanese is extreme, and that they are versed above all other Eastern nations in the arts of mendacity and evasion. The ministers of the Tycoon had

not the will, or not the power, to execute the Treaty. Indeed, it must be admitted that the results of their concessions were in the first instance fatal to themselves. Our ignorance of the political constitution and social condition of Japan, when the Treaty was made, was unavoidably so great, that we dealt with the Tycoon as the sovereign of the country, which he is not; and our negotiators were not aware that the personage with whose ministers they were treating, was in fact at that moment a corpse. The more our ignorance has been dispelled, the greater has become the difficulty of maintaining, by friendly means, the position we had acquired. Sir Rutherford Alcock succeeded therefore to a task of great difficulty, and, we must add, of great danger. It may be said, without the slightest exaggeration, that he and all the Christian representatives in Japan hold their lives in their hands. The British Legation, or its servants, have thrice been murderously attacked. The American Secretary, Mr. Heuskin, has been killed. Mr. Oliphant, our own Secretary, was hacked with swords in the dead of night. Two armed marines mounting guard at the door of Colonel Neale's chamber have been cut down by unseen enemies. It is a mere accident that anyone has escaped. These deliberate assassinations indicated a fixed intention on the part of their instigators to render Japan intolerable to strangers. It is altogether uncertain whether the Government at Jeddo did, or did not, connive at them. Yet for months together, the Admiral commanding on the Chinese station, incredulous of the danger, left the Legation to the inadequate and inappropriate protection of the 'Ringdove,' and we are surprised that the consequences were not even more fatal.

Before we proceed to consider the grave questions to which these events and their consequences are giving rise, let us, however, take another glance in Sir Rutherford's company at that superficial aspect of Japanese civilisation, which is so whimsical and amusing.

'Japan is essentially a country of anomalies, where all—even familiar things—put on new faces, and are curiously reversed. Except that they do not walk on their heads instead of their feet, there are few things in which they do not seem, by some occult law, to have been impelled in a perfectly opposite direction and a reversed order. They write from top to bottom, from right to left, in perpendicular instead of horizontal lines; and their books begin where ours end, thus furnishing good examples of the curious perfection this rule of contraries has attained. Their locks, though imitated from Europe, are all made to lock by turning the key from left to right. The course of all sublunary things appears reversed. Their day is for the most part our night; and this principle of antagonism

crops out in the most unexpected and *bizarre* way in all their moral being, customs, and habits. There old men fly kites while the children look on; the carpenter uses his plané by drawing it *to* him, and their tailors stitch *from* them; they mount their horses from the off-side—the horses stand in the stables with their heads where we place their tails, and the bells to their harness are always on the hind quarters instead of the front; ladies black their teeth instead of keeping them white, and their anti-crinoline tendencies are carried to the point of seriously interfering not only with grace of movement but with all locomotion, so tightly are the lower limbs, from the waist downwards, girt round with their garments;—and, finally, the utter confusion of sexes in the public bath-houses, making that correct, which we in the West deem so shocking and improper, I leave as I find it—a problem to solve.' (Vol. i. p. 414.)

This catalogue of contradictions might be greatly extended. With an enormous population to feed, and a high degree of agricultural industry, the land produces nothing but rice, corn, and vegetables; no cattle are kept, and no sheep or goats, consequently pastures and dairy produce are unknown. At Yokohama no chickens could be obtained for the table, though there are plenty of eggs. Grapes are grown, but the vintage is made into spirit, not into wine. Such is the ingenuity of this people that Japanese workmen constructed and worked in a boat a steam-engine with tubular boilers from Dutch plans, long before any American or European steamer had ever appeared in Japanese waters. In spite of the general use of the bath, which gave them at first the character of a cleanly people, it now appears that it is difficult to obtain the services of a Japanese attendant not infected with the itch, and that if they wash their bodies they neglect their clothes. Sir Rutherford assures us they have the finest macadamised roads in the world—the Tocado is a grand imperial route connecting Miaco with Jeddo and the consular post of Kanagawa; yet wheeled carriages are not used, and a day's journey at the usual rate of travelling is seventeen miles. The Mikado is said to be drawn by oxen—other persons ride or are carried by bearers. Mr. Oliphant told us that the first mission never encountered a drunken man; it now appears that the Japanese are as much given to drunkenness as any of the northern races of Europe, as quarrelsome as the worst, and far more dangerous in their cups. In Europe the Moxa is regarded as an extreme application, but every Japanese has it in his own hands as a household remedy; the cauterising tinder is made from the pith of a tree, put up into neat little squares for use; and it is even applied to new-born infants and women in childbirth—'three cones on the little toe of the right foot to facilitate delivery.' The

flowers of Japan are without scent. The music of the Japanese is horrible, and there is but one species of singing-bird known in the country; as if the 'stratagems and crimes' of the Daimios had extinguished the divine art. *En revanche*, the Japanese have carried the art of spinning tops to the highest perfection.

'The tops are of great variety, both in size and construction,—the largest or father of all the tops being more than a foot in diameter, and proportionately heavy—and while some are like this solid, others of the smaller ones contain in their cavities a whole progeny of little ones, which fly out on raising the top, and figure away like the parent; others again pull out into a ladder or spiral of successive tops; a third draws up into a lantern, and spins cheerily in that form. The most remarkable fact connected with some, seems to be the marvellous persistence of the gyrotory motion once communicated. This I thought at first might perhaps be in consequence of the form, which is a horizontal section of a cylinder, instead of being conical, as are those of Europe, with a thin iron rod passing through, forming a handle, a spindle, and a peg, each answering equally well for any of the three. But I afterwards ascertained that it was a top within a top. . . .

'I cannot pretend to describe half the performances, which extended over nearly three hours. One of the most frequent, as well as the most curious, was their mode of throwing even very large tops, as the New Zealanders throw the boomerang, so that while it appears to be going straight at the head of one of the spectators, it inevitably is brought back to the hand of the thrower, who catches it on his palm. It is a marvel to me, especially with some of the heavier, that the iron peg does not bore a hole in their hands. When thus caught, they take it by the spindle, apparently stop it, set it down, and it immediately recommences; turn it upside down, and it goes on just as merrily on its iron spiked head—they will balance it on any kind of surface, round or flat—on the edge of a fan—along a thin cord—and even on the edge of the sharpest Japanese sword—and after several minutes of such perpetual gyration, with intervals of apparent arrest in being transferred from one object to the other, it is thrown carelessly down on the table, and still continues spinning gaily, as if quite unexhausted, and inexhaustible. . . .

'One of the most delicate of the performances consisted in making a top spin in the left hand, run up the arm, round the edge of the robe at the back of the neck, and down the other arm into the palm of the right hand, still spinning. Another, again, was to toss a spinning top into the air and catch it on the hem of the sleeve, without letting it fall. A third was to fling it high in the air, and catch it on the bowl or the angle of a Japanese pipe, pass it behind the back, flinging it to the front, and there catching it again. Finally, one of the larger and heavier tops was given its gyrotory motion by simply rolling the peg in the bite of a cord, one end being held in each hand, then flung some ten or twenty feet in the air, and caught,

as it fell, with the same cord, spinning always, and this six, eight, and ten times in succession. The last grand display, which consisted in sending a top spinning up a rope to the head of a mast, was unavoidably postponed, the rain having drenched the cord, and rendered it impossible; but I have seen it since performed in the streets.

‘Certainly, I never saw a more perfect display of wonderful tact and dexterity, and there is evidently a great amount of humour and *vis comica* in the Japanese character, which tends to make all these exhibitions doubly amusing.’ (Vol. ii. p. 319.)

They certainly are a very humorous people. Without the least knowledge of the correct rules of design, they contrive to throw a burlesque expression into their sketches; and woodcuts, both plain and coloured, are in the greatest use. The caricatures published in Jeddo of the ‘perfidious strangers,’ in tight uniforms and Parisian bonnets, are extremely amusing. The carvings in ivory of comic subjects, displayed last year at the International Exhibition, were inimitably droll and exquisitely finished. But even their sense of humour seems to be exceeded by their utter indifference to truth. To extract from a Japanese, anything he does not wish you to know is as hard as to cross-examine a Welsh witness.

‘When Mr. Veitch was at Jeddo, on a visit to the Legation in quest of botanical specimens, he saw a pine-tree from which he desired a few seeds. “Oh,” said the inevitable yaconins, “those trees have no seed!” “But there they are,” replied the unreasonable botanist, pointing to some. “Ah yes, true; but they will not *grow*.” On another occasion, I wanted some seeds of the *Thujaopsis dolabrata*, the fine pine discovered by Thunberg, and a Governor of Foreign Affairs promised they should be got, but after three weeks’ time — and when it was too late to take other steps — he sent me a withered branch, saying that was the seed!’

This extreme mendacity of course affects their commercial relations with our merchants. They are preeminently dishonest, and the most ingenious and deliberate frauds are continually attempted at Yokohama and the other ports. Bales of silk are sold with the outward hanks of one quality and the inner of a coarser description, craftily interwoven. Jars of camphor with the top only genuine — the rest powdered rice. Tubs of oil, the lower half water. Money is taken for contracts and unblushingly misapplied or stolen, and one of the great grievances of foreign traders is that there really appear to be no courts of justice to enforce the performance of contracts, except by the intervention of the police. Their notions of morality in almost all the relations of life being extremely low, it must be added that their notions of religion are also incredibly degraded.

Whatever there was of elevation or spiritual truth in the Buddhist or Confucian systems of India and China seems to have been evaporated to the grossest formalism and practical unbelief by the Japanese mind and character. Sir Rutherford Alcock thinks they have still some obscure and imperfect doctrines of the immortality of the soul, but the educated classes scoff at these opinions. Among the masses there seems to be a kind of belief in a supreme God, but one who scarcely looks down upon this world, and many inferior deities, who influence the destiny of man. If they know little of God, they believe, as the incarnation of the evil principle, in *foeces*.

These traits, to which many similar examples might be added, serve to characterise a people of considerable intelligence, but utterly devoid of that spiritual power which governs man by the consciousness of a moral law above himself, which tells him of an immortal destiny, and prepares him for it. The Japanese, sunk in materialism, addicted to sensual gratifications, indecent in their manners, faithless in their engagements, false in their language, and alike reckless of the lives of others and of their own, are the very type of a race which has lost the higher element in man's nature and retained only his lower faculties and propensities. It is a hideous and a melancholy spectacle, not now seen for the first time in the history of the world, by any means, but never seen without the same repulsion and the same result. The whole course of history demonstrates that when a people has fallen to this depth of brutality, though it boast of many of the external ornaments of an advanced civilisation, its moral existence is at an end; and in obedience to some irresistible law of Providence, a nation armed with a higher degree of moral power crushes it. So Cyrus stormed the walls of Babylon: so the stern men of the North fell upon Rome: so Cortes overthrew the blood-stained altars of the Aztecs: so it would seem that, in our own days, the European nations are sent to change the condition of the further East. The ebb and the flow of the tides of history as clearly denote a directing will and ordinance, tending always to the progress of the world, as the courses of nature.

The rulers of Japan had the sagacity to perceive, at an early period, that whatever be the merits of that vaunted civilisation of the West, which they knew and feared chiefly by report, it was absolutely incompatible with their own laws, and usages, and even existence. The experiment of the seventeenth century left an indelible impression on their minds. Japan was then for a short period thrown open to Christian missionaries and Christian traders. The fervent courage and eloquence of

Saint Xavier himself planted the Cross on that polluted soil. The converts were counted by thousands. But those converts were taught that God had at Rome a Vicegerent and a Pontiff greater than the Mikado; that the laws of God were above the laws of the Tycoon; and that the first obligations of the Christian faith repudiated, as unclean, the usages of Japan. A period of war and bloodshed followed, not unlike that which has again commenced in these islands: and at length the resolution was taken to exterminate the faith of the strangers, even by the wholesale massacre of the Christian Japanese.

'In considering the antagonistic influences in full operation, more especially in Japan, it is necessary to show, honestly, how the question of religion tells upon our present relations and future prosperity. We have seen, independent of all antipathies of race, difference of language and customs, that there is political economy opposed in all its accredited and fundamental principles to the development of foreign commerce. Behind this obstacle, sufficiently formidable in itself, is a great gulf, into which the bodies of thousands of martyrs have been flung,—victims to the political aspect of Romanism more especially; but to all Christianity, as subversive of the temporal power. Finally, ranged beyond, and ready to do battle to the death, stands feudalism in full strength and vigour—feudalism, armed *cap-à-pie*, with its nobles and their followers, as it existed in Europe many centuries back. These feudal classes, with more or less intelligence as to cause and effect, but a true instinct, see the destruction of their privileges, and the subversion of their power in the progress of foreign relations and the full development of commerce. They see that we bring not only goods for sale, the purchase of which they believe will impoverish the nation, but new religions, new ideas of social order, liberty, and political rights, new customs and habits, all subversive of those now existing, and hostile to them and their order. In this farthest extremity of Eastern empire, Western civilisation is *aux prises* with feudalism, strong in its traditions and nationality, and defiant in its semi-chivalric and militant character. There are thus three great and well-defined obstacles to any progress—a POLITICAL ECONOMY opposed to free trade, a RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE founded on purely political considerations, and, lastly, a rampant FEUDALISM. How these three enemies to all progress are to be dealt with, and by what means they may best be encountered and overcome, is the question of questions—the one difficulty which lies at the root of all others.' (Vol. i. p. 348.)

How then is this extraordinary country governed, and with whom are our present and future relations to be carried on? The following sketch of the Japanese constitution is of great interest:—

'Japan appears to be actually governed, at the present day, by a sort of federal aristocracy, recalling in some respects that of the

Lombard dukes;—and France under the Merovingian kings; or the early state of the Germans when their kings were elected out of particular families. A confederation of Princes and territorial Seigneurs possess the land, enjoying apparently very much the same kind of jurisdiction as our own barons in the days of the Saxon rule or the first Plantagenets. The Prince of Satsuma with his colonial dependencies of the Loochoo Islands; the Prince of Xendai with large territories; the Prince of Kaga, and many others, each with larger revenues and more men-at-arms, probably, than the virtual and *de facto* Sovereign the Tycoon himself could bring into the field—might any one of them play the part of an Earl of Warwick. If not in the present day, yet not three centuries ago, these were in the habit, separately or in combination, of setting not only the Tycoon, but his and their Sovereign, the Mikado, at defiance with arms in their hands. It was their feuds and rebellions which in the twelfth century gave to Yoritomo the means of usurping the quasi sovereignty of the Tycoonat, only then constituted by the victorious commander-in-chief of the imperial armies, which were originally set in motion for their subjugation. *Taico-Sama* towards the close of the sixteenth century did much to break the still dangerous power of these semi-feudatory but really independent princes. He only succeeded, however, by courting the alliance of some of the more puissant of them, and leaving their sovereign rights or pretensions untouched. There are many who thus succeed to their hereditary dominions and honours with all rights and immunities attaching from time immemorial, without any formal recognition or investiture by the Tycoon. Their allegiance is obviously more nominal than real, and is held by the slightest tenure. They are strong in their feudal rights and feudal power, while he is weak in his avowed subordination to the only acknowledged Suzerain of all, the Mikado, who is invested not only with all the prestige of hereditary descent in an unbroken line from the first Supreme rulers of the Empire, but tracing back through such ancestry, according to Japanese traditions, a divine origin. He adds the infallibility and pretensions of a Pope of the middle ages, to the temporal rights of sovereignty of a later era. And although he has been shorn of much, if not all, of his real power, as popes have been ere now, and this ever since the Crown-General Yoritomo's successful usurpation;—yet still the supreme dignity, rank, sanctity, and prerogatives have ever been the undisputed attributes of the Mikado, and his alone. . . . The changes of the dynasty in nothing affected the Mikados or their succession. They continued inheritors by right divine of their phantom sceptre, preserving still some remnants of their former unlimited and absolute power. Their investiture is still theoretically essential to the Tycoon to consecrate his election, as is their sanction to any changes in the fundamental laws, and their ratification to any new treaties. The want of this, in the case of the treaties with European Powers, there is every reason to believe, as I have shown, lies at the root of our difficulties in Japan. The Tycoon, on the first appearance of an American squadron in 1853, driven by a certain pressure and dangers which seemed to him imminent, entered ap-

parently into treaties without this needful sanction of his Suzerain ; against his fiat, it is said, and is *therefore* powerless to give them execution throughout Japan. In the absence of this, and a formal ratification, he can at most pretend to give them effect throughout his own territories, in which the Consular Ports are situated, and with *his own subjects*. The Daimios, hostile to the innovation as a body, and never sorry, it would seem, to use their allegiance to the Suzerain of both, as a check to the encroaching power of the Tycoon, do not recognise these treaties as binding upon *them*. . . . We have in presence, therefore, a dual system of sovereigns, each with their separate court, high officers, and nobles ; next a class of nominal feudatories, the *bonâ fide* rulers of the country in detail under a feudal system. And over all, intertwined and twisted round every individual member of this tripartite hierarchy of two sovereigns—their courts of great officers—and a class of great territorial barons, each of whom enjoys a petty and semi-avowed independent sovereignty, there is cast like a spell an elaborate network of espionage, which seeks to control by treachery and finesse those who cannot be subjected by overt force, and to bring all under one bondage or system of government. This part of the Tycoon's administrative system involves a duty which sends his officers into the several princes' territories, a service, it would appear, of veritable danger. There was presented to me one day a Japanese of considerable official rank, who for obvious reasons I will not more particularly describe, of whose history I had an outline. One of the incidents, to the credit of his wit and astuteness, which most struck me, was the fact of his having been the only one of the seven *ometskys* or spies sent successively into the Prince of Satsuma's territories,—who ever came out alive.' (Vol. i. p. 237–40.)

The history of the conclusion of the treaties and their fatal results to the persons engaged in the negotiations is what might be expected from such a state of society. Sir Rutherford Alcock has for the first time collected the materials of this strange narrative.

'Each of the two American Treaties cost the reigning Tycoon his life. Each page seems to have been written in blood ; and each phrase to have demanded a victim. Of the number and identity of these there is at least no question. When Commodore Perry first arrived (in 1853), Minamoto Jejosli had reigned seventeen years as Tycoon. He is said to have been a prince of energy and experience, and to have carried weight in the council of Daimios by his superior intelligence. On the first news of the arrival of a foreign fleet in the forbidden waters, the Daimios severally charged with the defence of that part of the coast are said to have mustered, in two days, 10,000 men, with artillery, commanded by three princes of large revenue and consideration, whose names are given. The President's letter, however, it was resolved should be received ; and a year's delay was demanded for time to assemble a great council of Daimios.

A few days after the Tycoon died suddenly. The following is said to be the palace chronicle of the mode of his death, and the subsequent events.

'Minamoto's prime minister was Midzouno Etsisenno-Kami, a stout defender of old laws and customs, and he, it is said, conspired with other Daimios then in the capital, as to the means of *saving the country from foreign influence*. It was agreed that the Tycoon should be poisoned, and some charged Etsisen-no-Kami with views of aggrandisement for himself, as future regent, the Tycoon's only son being of infirm mind. But when the cup containing the poison was presented to the Tycoon by one of the officers who had been tampered with, some thing roused the suspicions of the destined victim, and he threw the cup with its contents into his attendant's face, who instantly drew his sword and ran him through the body, killing himself immediately afterwards. Midzouno Etsisen was loudly accused by the Tycoon's followers.—and he also performed the *Hara-Kiru*.

'Minamoto Yesado, the son aforesaid, succeeded his father, and Ikumono-no-Kami became Regent, that office being hereditary in his family whenever, from minority or other cause, the reigning Tycoon shall be incapable of governing. In the conflict of opinions respecting foreign relations, Ikumono is described as preserving a neutral position, and refusing to pronounce a decided opinion on either side. His first act was to summon a great council to deliberate on the answer to be given to the American propositions to enter into a treaty. All the Daimios of 50,000 kokous of rice in revenue, and upwards, were invited to assist, and even those with less, who were in any way distinguished. Many advocated resistance *à l'outrance*. At the head of these was the Prince of Mito, supported by many powerful Daimios. The Prince of Kago, with a revenue of 10,000,000 kokous, is reported to have placed his hand on his sword in full council, exclaiming, "Rather than consent to enter into a treaty, it "were better to die fighting!" The Prince of Mito deemed the dignity of the country compromised, if the subversive changes and the relations proposed by the Americans were admitted, and advocated the acceptance of such relations only as were consistent with their old established policy. . . .

'It was determined, however, in view of the unprepared state of the defences, to seem to listen—and to temporise, making such treaty only as might seem necessary, to avoid an immediate declaration of war, which they evidently considered the probable consequence of any total denial. We know the President's instructions were to abstain from all menace of war or employment of force. How far Commodore Perry's action was calculated to give a different idea, we need not very closely inquire. One thing is certain, such was not the impression received by the Japanese.

'The Prince of Mito, it would appear, had the idea of profiting by all this conflict and confusion, either by becoming himself Tycoon or securing the election of his son. One of the Gosankay (the name given to the royal house, descended from the three brothers of the founder

of the existing dynasty), he had legitimate pretensions, in the event of a vacancy; while the present occupant had no son, and was not in a state to exercise the power of adopting one to succeed him. But it was an old grief of this branch of the royal descendants, that they had ever been excluded in favour of some heir of the other houses, the Princes of Kiusiu or Owari, when an election had taken place. Moved by these motives, Mito plotted to put himself at the head of a powerful body of the Daimios inimical to the new relations established with foreign Powers, to poison the reigning Tycoon, and secure the succession.

‘When the second American treaty negotiated by Mr. Harris was under discussion, it is supposed he actively opposed the final signature; and when this was consummated in the precipitate manner already detailed,—under pressure of the announced arrival of victorious fleets from China with plenipotentiaries of two great maritime Powers of Europe, the hour for action arrived; and the Tycoon had ceased to live before Lord Elgin’s appearance the following month! The Gotairo, as the regent is officially styled, had no doubt from whence the blow came. He instantly had all the attendants in the palace seized, and by torture wrung from them confessions criminating the Prince of Mito. He sent to the latter an order of banishment to his territories, giving him to understand, *that if instantly obeyed*, it should only be temporary: and if resisted, he should be charged before the great council with the poisoning of the Tycoon, for which the penalty was crucifixion. In the event of his quietly abandoning the field, it was further promised him, that his crime should not be divulged. Overawed by so much vigour and determination, or unprepared for such prompt action, the Prince of Mito accepted the alternative and retired,—discomfited and compromised, to his principality. The elective council was immediately convoked, and the young Prince of Kiusiu, whose father was still alive, was duly elected Tycoon; to the exclusion of the Prince of Mito and his son. The latter, unlike this heir of the house of Kiusiu, was a man of thirty, instead of a boy of fifteen. But the minority of the former was no doubt one of his recommendations, since it left the power in the hands of the Regent Ikonomo, which he promptly exercised, it seems, to issue a decree of perpetual banishment against the old Prince of Mito, and deposition in favour of his son. This, according to the received accounts, was an act of treachery and a breach of faith on the part of the Gotairo,—and we shall see later how it was avenged.

‘From causes not very clearly understood or explained, there was, contemporaneously, a total change in the composition of the Gorogio or Great Council of State, forming in fact the cabinet or government of the Tycoon, and consisting of five ministers. Those in office when the treaty was signed were all disgraced, and disappeared from the scene, as well as nearly all their subordinates. A complete palace revolution appears to have taken place, consequent on the double event of the signature of the second of the American treaties and the murder of the Tycoon. . . .

‘The hostile party now came into power, it is said, and have ever

since remained. Midzuo Tsikfogono, the chief of the ministry when I arrived, had been called from his retirement to enter anew on the cares of office, as the best representative, it is to be assumed, of the conservative, retrograde, or patriotic party—for all these titles may be laid claim to. They are opposed to the introduction of any foreign elements—persons, goods, or ideas—as pregnant with mischief and fraught with danger to the stability of the empire. By some it is believed that there is a progressive party in Japan, in advance, at all events, of those whom they stigmatise as “*toads in a well*,”—the latter being supposed to see but a very small speck above their heads and under their eyes, and to enjoy no breadth of view. But I confess, the longer my experience, the more doubtful it has appeared to me. The only true distinction, so far as we are concerned, is, I believe, one of degree only; degree, that is, of opposition; and based rather upon the relative timidity or courage of the leaders, than any leaning to advanced views. Those who are timid or wary, advocate a temporising policy to gain time for better preparation, or at least to defer the evil day. The more rash or courageous would fling down the gauntlet, and like the Prince of Kago prefer to die with swords in their hands, than tolerate any longer the presence of the foreigner, and the danger of change and revolution which he brings inevitably in his train.’ (Vol. ii. p. 217–21.)

We must borrow one more extract which concludes this unexampled history and explains the murder of the Gotairo himself, which we had occasion to relate with some detail in a former Number of this Journal (Ed. Rev. cxiii. p. 60.):—

‘When his son Menamotto Yesado was gathered to his fathers, after the signature of the second American treaty negotiated by Mr. Harris in 1858—with or “without the aid of medicine,” according to the odd phraseology of the Japanese in similar cases (though there is a popular conviction that he *had* the aid of medicine, of the most effective kind), and a minor of the royal house of Kiusiu was elected to fill the vacant place, Ikōmono-no-Kami became Regent by hereditary right. And, it may fairly be presumed, he had not been without influence in an election by the great council of Daimios, which, while it excluded the house of Mito—father and son both of mature age—virtually placed the executive power of the realm in his hands. But the reader knows this was not the only grievance, real or fancied, of the Prince of Mito—then an old man of sixty—against the Regent. He was accused by the latter of the murder of the last Tycoon, Minamotto Yesado, by poison; and on the strength of it had him banished to his territories, as a temporary measure, under promise of speedy release. So far from this, one of the first acts of the council, under the regency of Ikōmono-no-kami, was to depose him from his principality in favour of his son, and to pass a sentence of perpetual banishment from the capital. Hence the plot of Mito’s followers to avenge their Prince for this double act of treachery—and, if there be any truth in the popular version, more devoted or determined adherents no prince in the feudal ages of Europe could

ever boast. The head of the Regent is said to have been got safely out of Yeddo, and presented to the Prince their master, who spat upon it with maledictions, as the head of his greatest enemy. It was then carried to Miaco, the capital of the Mikado, and there exposed at a place of execution in that city especially destined for princes condemned to be executed—"Sidio onagawara" it is called, and over it was placed a placard "This is the head of a traitor who has violated the most sacred laws of Japan—those which forbid the admission of foreigners into the country." After two hours of exposure, the same intrepid followers are said to have brought it away; and in the night to have cast it over the wall into the court of Ikonomo's palace at Yeddo, from whence he had sallied out in pride and power on the morning of his death.' (Vol. ii. p. 257.)

In the Appendix to this work we find extracted from a native publication described as the 'Red book' of Japan, or official record of the nobility, a table of the Daimios with the revenues attributed to them. If reliance can be placed on these statements, they are very extraordinary. It would seem that computing the territorial revenues of the great princes of Japan in *kokous* of rice, at the rate of 13s. 10d. per *kokou* of one hundred poundweight, there are about twenty-six Daimios with independent incomes beginning at 769,728*l.* sterling, and descending to 100,000*l.*; and the list gradually descends through a host of minor personages to revenues of 16,000*l.* and 12,000*l.* a year. The number of these wealthy nobles is stated to be about six hundred. We are informed that the Daimios are actually assessed by the Tycoon at these enormous amounts, for the purpose, probably, of exacting contributions from them under the form of benevolences granted on certain great occasions such as the 'joyous welcome' or marriage of the Prince. It does not appear that they are subject to any regular form of taxation. But we are unable to credit these prodigious incomes attributed to the Japanese Daimios: if they were true, these nobles would be the richest aristocracy in the world, far exceeding in wealth the highest classes in the British Empire. The probability seems to be that these large nominal amounts, which cannot be strictly accurate, are no more than a loose mode of stating in *kokous* of rice the extent of the territories owned by the nobles. The revenues of the Tycoon are, it seems, raised in the same manner from the rent of land, but he takes a smaller proportion of the gross produce than the nobles. The Daimios are said to own great part of the soil of Japan—each estate is surveyed once or twice a year, and the tenant pays six parts in ten in kind or in rice (as nearly as can be ascertained) to the landowner. The revenues of the six hundred Daimios thus raised are doubtless large. They are spent in maintaining large bodies of profligate

and lawless military retainers who are the curse of the country, and by whom the numerous crimes we deplore are all committed. But no Eastern country is really rich, and if such revenues as these are raised only to be squandered by the unproductive classes, the nation must be constantly more and more impoverished. The wonder is that nobles of this high degree of wealth, power, and independence should ever have consented to submit at all to the authority of the Tycoon, and still more to the exigencies of a vigorous system of police. Thus the Daimios were (till very lately) compelled to reside chiefly in Jeddo; yet they are prohibited from visiting one another, as none but blood relations cross each other's thresholds; and in every detail of life they are the victims of the jealous policy of the more than Venetian oligarchy to which they belong. Their submission to the Tycoon appears to be local, and confined to the spots and posts in which he has sway, of which Jeddo is one. The authority of the Mikado is more extensive; hence Sir Rutherford suggests that, in order to give real effect to the Treaties,

‘The avowed sanction of the Mikado in some authentic documents bearing his seal, to be published throughout the Empire, and the responsible acceptance in no less authentic form of the treaties on the part of the principal Daimios possessing large territories and fortresses, notably those of Satsuma, Fizen, Xendai, and Kaga, and from whom alone any hostility could be material—might furnish effective guarantees for security and peace, if not for any rapid development of trade.’ (Vol. ii. p. 224.)

It seems certain that the Tycoon has not, and never had power, to abrogate any of the laws of the empire. Therefore the laws of Gongen Sama, the great founder of the existing dynasty, are still in force, denouncing as high treason, with death for the penalty, any one harbouring a foreigner within the realm, and commanding all good and loyal subjects to slay and exterminate any of the hated race who may ever venture to desecrate the sacred soil of Nipon with their presence. ‘Any one,’ says Sir Rutherford, ‘may slay us and plead in justification the laws of the land.’ And with this people we profess to carry on diplomatic intercourse! The first principles of agreement are wanting. The comity of civilised nations takes the representatives of foreign countries under its especial protection: an outrage offered to them is a blot on the national escutcheon; in Japan they may even be murdered with impunity. In other countries it is honourable to respect treaties, in Japan it is honourable to evade and repudiate them. Foreign nations are desirous of opening and extending the trade of

Japan; the Japanese are still as anxious as ever to prohibit foreign commerce, and the effect of the Treaties by raising the prices of many articles and causing an export of the precious metals, has only served to strengthen their prejudices. Moreover, the advantages of the trade have, it appears, been monopolised by the officers of the Tycoon, who is lord of the open ports; the Daimios have not shared them, and the people have suffered from a rise in prices and a drain of gold.

But although the Japanese have no conception of what we consider the sacred observances of international law, they have other points of honour peculiar to themselves, and of these the first is that 'when the subjects or vassals of one prince affront those of another, the latter is dishonoured if he does not 'avenge it.' Hence blood-feuds of extreme ferocity are of perpetual occurrence; and they are perfectly aware that in the course of the last few years outrages without number have been offered to foreigners to which no native Daimio would submit; but as no results have as yet followed these outrages, they are content to assume that every obligation contracted with foreigners may be systematically evaded with impunity.

We must refer our readers to the pages of Sir Rutherford Alcock's book for the narrative of the crimes which give so frightful an interest to these missions. The first victims were some Russian officers; the next was the linguist of the British Legation: a warning was then given to the Abbé attached to the French Mission, which was followed by the murder of two Dutch captains. The assassination of Mr. Heuskin, the American Secretary, was the next outrage, for they gained courage as they proceeded. The four Légations then withdrew from Jeddo, and apologies were offered by the Government. But they were of small avail, for no sooner had Sir Rutherford consented to return (having judiciously employed the interval in travelling in the interior) than the Legation was attacked by at least fourteen bravos of the Prince of Tsusima's household. Since then fresh murders have been committed, some by the very men sent to protect the Mission, some on the highway by Kanagawa. All these events have taken place within the last four years. They establish beyond all doubt this position — either that Christian States must find means to compel the Japanese to respect their envoys, or that the envoys must be withdrawn. It is impossible to continue to send men of honour and courage in the public service to be butchered by nocturnal assassins.

If we were inclined to take at all a favourable view of the case, we should be inclined to suggest that the Ministers of

the Tycoon have been more disposed than any other Japanese to execute the treaties; but they have been overruled and intimidated by the great Daimios, who are our chief enemies. The Prince of Satsuma and the Prince of Mito are beyond doubt the leaders of the native party. The chief attacks and crimes have been committed by their retainers. It seems probable that the assault on the British Legation was an act of vengeance absurdly directed by the Prince of Tsushima against us, because a few weeks before a Russian squadron had threatened his own island of the same name, on the coast of Corea. If this be the case, it may be possible to maintain friendly relations with the Court of the Tycoon at Jeddo, and to direct our remonstrances against the Daimios. No less than one hundred and forty-three of these princes have estates and fortresses of their own, many of which are exposed to attack from the sea; and if it should be necessary to take decided measures to obtain redress for the outrages of which several innocent British subjects have been the victims, it may well deserve consideration whether those measures should not be directed against the powerful vassals, who are the real authors of these crimes, rather than against the Government of the Tycoon and the inoffensive people of Japan. The principal island of the Lieukieu group (commonly called Loo-Choo) belongs to the Prince of Satsuma, and he derives a considerable revenue from it. Our attempts to trade with Loo-choo many years ago were defeated, because the Governor declared that if he allowed the people to trade with us they would forthwith be cut off from their trade with Japan. Sir Rutherford Alcock hints in once place that we may be driven to possess ourselves of some material guarantee for the observance of treaties, and the occupation of a single island with a good harbour in proximity to Japan, and with the power of communicating to and fro, might be preferable to a precarious residence, miscalled a diplomatic mission, in Jeddo.

‘As to the actual state of our relations, there was, indeed, much room for improvement. Life was insecure, trade was being daily restricted, and no remonstrance, protest, or argument within the scope of diplomatic means, had hitherto much availed to turn the authorities from a policy, the manifest tendency of which was to nullify the treaties, restrict all intercourse, and ultimately revert to the former state of isolation, by the expulsion of foreigners. To make trade unprofitable by restrictions, extortions, and prohibitions imposed on their own people, with whom their power is absolute; and render life not only so insecure, but intolerable in the conditions of residence, that no foreigner would long submit or find such an existence endurable,—seemed really to have been the chief object

kept in view during nearly two years. This was the summary of their policy; and if these milder measures failed, the bravo's sword, for assassination, was always in reserve, and held *in terrorem* over the heads of the intruders on their soil, to be resorted to as occasion might serve, without ruth or scruple.

'Such had been the continuous and unchanging course of events, since the first hour of the opening of the ports. The situation of all the Western Powers at this moment might be summed up in a few words. The treaties had in all their more important stipulations been systematically and persistently rendered inoperative; and they now proposed, as a political necessity imposed upon *them* by the nature of the case and the exasperation of the public mind, the suspension of all farther execution, by deferring the opening of other ports for a term of years. Having thus provided against any development of trade, and avowed the necessity of preventing its extension for the present, under plea of which they were doing much to destroy it, they also allowed the lives of the foreign representatives, and all other foreigners, to be so demonstrably insecure, that the authors of such a system might be pardoned if they counted with some certainty upon their not being long molested by the presence of such hated intruders into the country. Trade hampered and manacled, life menaced, national rights violated, with outrage to the flags, and without a hope of redress or amelioration—all with impunity. This in résumé depicts the situation.' (Vol. ii. p. 47.)

It will be admitted that our principal, if not our sole motive, for establishing and maintaining any relations at all with Japan was the hope of opening that market to our manufactures and trade. As for the export trade from Japan, it is of no real moment, except as a means of exchange, for the silk and tea we obtain from Kanagawa may be procured without limit and without difficulty in Shanghai and the other Chinese ports. The total value of foreign imports into Japan in 1861 amounted to 448,000*l.*, and of exports from Japan to 762,000*l.*: of this amount England takes about two-thirds. But this sum comprises a large quantity of bulky articles, chiefly edibles, for the Chinese market. The total value of manufactured goods imported into Japan in the six months ending in June, 1862, was only 68,000*l.* Sir R. Alcock may, therefore, well observe that 'nothing Japan is likely 'either to take or to give can be considered as otherwise 'than trifling' in comparison to the whole trade of Great Britain: and again, 'Not all the merchants, with all the Consuls 'and Ministers combined, can make any essential change in the 'system and action of the Japanese authorities, high and low. 'This can only come with time—or political and social revolutions.' It is therefore certain that at present, and probably for a long time to come, our mercantile relations with Japan are

scarcely worth the anxiety and bloodshed they have occasioned; and that a single month of war would absorb the whole profit of years. As a speculation, the opening of the trade with Japan has not paid, and is not likely to pay, the British nation what it may cost us.

But we are told that, however precarious and worthless our political and commercial position in Japan may be, we are compelled by a sense of our own dignity to maintain it, and that it is impossible to recede without a loss of prestige, which may be highly injurious to our national interests in the East. Lord Russell writes to Colonel Neale on the 22nd of September last:—

‘Her Majesty’s Government desire, therefore, that you should show in any possible way that Her Majesty’s Government will not be deterred from their course by these shameful murders. It would be better that the Tycoon’s palace should be destroyed than that our rightful position by treaty should be weakened or impaired.’ (*Parl. Papers*, p. 50.)

Unfortunately the destruction of the Tycoon’s palace will not at all settle the question. The notion of Asiatics as to treaties with Europeans is, for the most part, that they are compacts extorted by fear for our benefit and their injury; and they have not the slightest hesitation in breaking or evading them whenever the force which imposed them is withdrawn. To maintain our ‘rightful position’ we must have a considerable naval force at the expense of this country in the Japanese waters. That we have acquired these rights by treaty is indisputable: but we are nevertheless at liberty to consider whether it is worth while to spend more English money and English blood in enforcing them. We very much doubt it; and we are confirmed in this opinion by Sir Rutherford Alcock’s experience of Japan. Meanwhile, it is by no means impossible that the Tycoon himself and his ministers may be overpowered by the party of nobles, most hostile to foreigners, and that they may resolve at all risks to break off all relations with the Treaty-Powers, and even to exterminate the trading settlements at the open ports.

Another argument is, however, used, to which we acknowledge that some weight is due. We have to deal not with the Japanese alone, but in some measure with other European Powers in Japan, and more especially with Russia. By the enormous concessions of territory Russia has in the last few years obtained from China in Manchouria, she now extends far south of the Amoor River and Port Broughton, along the Corean Coast; and she has more than once threatened the island of Tsusima, which, in the hands of a European Power,

might command the sound between Corea and Japan. Sir Rutherford says :—

‘In these latitudes we are confronted with Russia and her fast increasing establishments on the Manchourian coast. From the extension and prosperity of her commerce we have nothing to fear, but rather cause for rejoicing. Seas covered with a commercial navy are pledges of peace and not incitements to hostile aggression, on the part of the nation possessing it. But predominance of a military kind, by ships of war and fortified harbours, becomes a source of danger to any commerce less efficiently protected. Something of this latter predominance Russia appears to be seeking now in all the seas between the coast of China and Manchouria on the one side, with the Japanese Isles as a fringe and the eastern coasts of America on the other; between which lie all the treasures of a yet undeveloped but certainly increasing trade in the Pacific. The possession of Corea and Japan, or portions of them, would give to any aggressive maritime Power almost inexhaustible resources, in coal, the precious metals—in iron, lead, and sulphur—in harbours of refuge and fortified depôts—in timber and labour for ship-building—and even in hardy seamen. The means of attack these would supply to Russia, in the event of any designs against the commerce of Great Britain, both in the China seas and the Pacific, from the shores of Australia to those of America, gives us a pressing and momentous interest in any question of annexation or conquest in the Japanese seas, the only link wanted to complete her chain of empire round the world.

‘While we have treaty rights ostensibly in Japan, conquest or annexation without our concurrence would be difficult. Looking to the recent acquisitions of Russia in China, and other evidences of a fixed policy of advance in this eastern extremity of Asia towards unfrozen seas and ports denied her in the West; and a lion's share in the *spolia opima* of the trade, in the seas between the coast of America and China across the Pacific; there can be little doubt Japan would become a portion of the Russian empire at no distant date, if other European Powers retired.’ (Vol. ii. p. 219.)

We cannot accept this sweeping conclusion, which would have the effect of adding a European quarrel to an Asiatic difficulty. But Russia is undoubtedly become the nearest and most formidable neighbour of Japan. She has now acquired harbours giving her advantages for the navigation of the Eastern seas that she possesses nowhere else; and she wisely maintains no legation at Jeddo, but a powerful squadron on the coast.

The policy of Russia in the far East has been very openly discussed at St. Petersburg. A writer in the Russian Military Magazine for September 1860 (published under the patronage of the Emperor), states broadly that ‘if Russia ever become a strong naval Power by establishing her mercantile and military fleets in the Pacific, she will be in a condition to take part in

'the solution of those universal questions which now exclusively concern England and France.' Before any of the recent acquisitions of Russia on the eastern coasts of Asia were effected, Captain Nevelskoi, of the Imperial Navy, one of the pioneers of the Amoor country, reported to his government that 'the entire basin of the Assuri, and the coast of Manchouria as far as the Corea, must constitute Russian, not Chinese, territory.' The writer already referred to points to Victoria (Peter the Great) Bay, in about 41° N.L., as the future Russian Sevastopol of the Pacific*; and he even advocates the acquisition of the Japanese island of Yezo (in which Hakodadi is situated), for the purpose of excluding the other maritime Powers from the coasts of Manchouria and the Yellow Sea.

Nor have the advances of the Russians in this quarter been confined to mere speculation. In May 1861, one of our surveying vessels in those seas discovered that a Russian corvette, the '*Possadnick*,' under the command of Captain Barileff, had entered the fine roadstead of the small island of Tsusima, about eighteen miles from the Corean coast and thirty from Japan, under pretence of repairs: the vessel was dismantled; the crew were established on shore in substantial wooden houses; the Russian flag was hoisted on shore; quarrels ensued with the Japanese, in which some of them were killed; and the Russians assumed a degree of authority in the island which led the suspicious Court of Jeddo to suppose that the occupation of Tsusima was contemplated by them. Admiral Hope sent a British ship to the spot to report on these proceedings, and the result was that a strong remonstrance was addressed to the Russian commander, and, we believe, that on the arrival of our own naval force in the neighbourhood, the design of making a permanent establishment in Tsusima was abandoned. The island itself is of no value as a commercial port; but its fine harbour, formed by great fiords running inland, is well adapted for a naval station; though it may be doubted whether this would be of any value to the Russians, who already possess the harbours on the opposite Corean coast. The ministers of the Tycoon, who had entirely failed to dislodge these Russian emissaries by their own remonstrances, and who had no maritime force to back them, were extremely

* The great object of Russia is to obtain a harbour for her fleet which shall be open at all seasons of the year. Olga Bay (known to English sailors as Port Michael Seymour) is at present made the winter quarters of the Russian squadron in the Eastern Seas: the inner harbour is frozen in the winter, but not the outer one.

obliged to the British admiral for the assistance he afforded them in this matter; and this is probably not the only time they may perceive that the mutual jealousies of the maritime States of Europe are the best protection of their own territorial independence.

It has sometimes been argued (and Sir R. Alcock appears to incline to this opinion) that in the event of our being compelled to exact from the Japanese reparation for past acts of violence and a pledge for the future safety of the Queen's subjects in Japan, it might be expedient to hold and occupy some point on or near the coast, as in the first Chinese war we held Chusan, and permanently hold Hong Kong. But it must be observed that measures of coercion of this nature (if we should be compelled to resort to them) are apt to become onerous rather than profitable to ourselves, whilst they serve as a precedent and a justification to the aggressions of others. We complain of the evident design of Russia to make an establishment in the island of Tsushima; but Russia would have equal reason to complain of us if we had similar views; and, in fact, whilst the policy would be questionable, the possession itself would be useless. The constant apprehension entertained by the Japanese that Foreign Powers contemplate, sooner or later, the acquisition of territory which would give them an actual footing in the empire, tends materially to aggravate the feelings of irritation and hatred with which foreigners are regarded in Japan. If it were possible to convince the Japanese that England does not seek to acquire any territory in Japan for herself, and that she will not view with indifference the designs or attempts of conquest or occupation on the part of any other Power, a step would be made to the improvement of our relations; because the Japanese ministers would then perceive that the goodwill of England is, in reality, the best security of their own independence. We think, then, that, upon the whole, the true policy of England and the other Maritime States is to support the authority of the Tycoon, and to maintain his rights, in opposition to the alleged sovereignty of the Mikado and the armed resistance of the Daimios; and if we are unhappily driven into a more active participation in these quarrels, we must side with the party least adverse to our own interests. But we do not disguise our opinion that it would be for the advantage of England, if it were possible, to withdraw altogether from the scene of so much bloodshed and intrigue, for which, as we think, the mercantile profits of a few adventurous traders offer to the country at large no compensation.

It is probable that at this very time these questions are about

to be brought to a peremptory solution. Lord Russell has instructed Colonel Neale to demand 10,000*l.*, paid in gold, by way of compensation to the families of the two British marines who were murdered on the 26th June last; and also the open degradation and severe punishment of the Daimio who ought to have protected the Legation, but who was in reality privy to the murder. Still stronger demands for redress have doubtless been made in the case of Mr. Richardson, who was murdered on the high road from Kanagawa; and we presume that her Majesty's naval forces have been instructed to support these claims. The Government of the Tycoon replies that it has not the power or the right to arrest criminals who have taken refuge in the territories of the great feudatories, and that it can only demand their extradition. If this be so, we must ourselves exact redress from the real authors of these crimes; and perhaps the Ministers of the Tycoon may view without dissatisfaction measures taken to inflict punishment where it is justly due. We anticipate therefore that, before the appearance of our next Number, events of considerable importance will have occurred in Japan and will be known in this country.

On all these matters Sir Rutherford Alcock's book is by far the most copious and faithful guide which has yet been given us. It is highly satisfactory that this work has been published at the present time; because, after all, the policy to be pursued must be determined by the Cabinet, the Parliament, and the public of England, rather than by diplomatic interviews at Jeddo. It is our duty to ascertain what is just, necessary, and expedient in our dealings with the Japanese; and these volumes are an admirable contribution to the stock of knowledge we have been able to acquire with reference to this singular people.

- ART. IX.—1. *Evidence as to Man's Place in Nature*. By T. H. HUXLEY. 8vo. London: 1863.
2. *Osteological Contributions to the Natural History of the Anthropoid Apes*. By R. OWEN. (*Transactions of the Zoological Society of London*.) 4to. London: 1840—1863.
3. *Teeth in the Varieties of Man and the Anthropoid Apes*. By F. C. WEBB. 8vo. London: 1860.
4. *Mémoire sur les Plis Cérébraux de l'Homme et des Primatés*. By M. GRATIOTET. 4to. Paris: 1854.

THE disputes with regard to the precise affinity and relations of man to the lower animals have now excited so much acrimony, and have assumed such proportions, that we feel at length compelled to offer an opinion upon this controversy. The efforts of the human mind, in all historic times, to penetrate and explain the deep mystery of the origin of the human race, have once more, been revived with an intensity of purpose surpassing all previous example; and we shall best promote the object in view if we direct attention to those important physical facts connected with the inquiry, which must form the true basis of any accurate generalisation. We shall accordingly proceed to examine the main questions at issue, with the view of removing, if possible, some of the scientific, as well as popular, errors which prevail upon the subject.

The *Homo sapiens* of Linnæus, which the learned Swede defined to be in its wild aboriginal statè, fourfooted, mute, and hairy, and which, brought under the more civilised influences of clothing and social habits, expanded into the American, European, Arabic, African races — besides the monstrous varieties comprising the *crétin* of the Alps, the giant of Patagonia, the Hottentot, the short and pyramidal-skulled Chinese, and the flatheaded Indian of Canada, — represented the idea which our ancestors formed of the human animal a hundred years ago. Linnæus, however, admitted a second species of man, as he deemed the *Homo nocturnus*, or *Troglodytes*. He considered this animal to be white, always erect, the hands reaching the knees, concealing itself during the daytime, virtually blind, and accustomed to wander forth in the night for plunder. Although its language was an unintelligible hiss, the attributes of thought and reason are predicated by Linnæus of his *Homo nocturnus*, in which there is reason to believe that the characters of the chimpanzee and those of the white negro,

or *Blafard*, were confusedly intermingled. The Swedish naturalist, however, while he thus misconceived the zoological character of the great ape from West Africa, appreciated in its true signification the systematic value of the other equally gigantic form of ape, which exists in the Indian archipelago, his *Simia satyrus*; and although he erroneously applied to this ape the term 'chimpanzee,' we recognise under this description the *oran-ûtan* of later writers.

If the zoologist attempts to find in the feeble and vague sketches of the manlike apes which were given by the elder naturalists, anything approaching to the accuracy of definition now essential to the systematic idea of species, he will be grievously disappointed. The work of Tyson, 'A philosophical Essay concerning the Pigmies, the Cynocephali, the Satyrs and Sphinges of the Ancients, wherein it will appear that they were all either Apes or Monkeys, and not Men, as formerly pretended,' furnishes an example of those speculations by which our forefathers sought to identify the traditions of mythology with the forms of zoological life. We shall entirely pass over, therefore, the controversy, not capable of any practical demonstration, whether the animals which Hanno and his companions flayed and deposited in the Punic temples, and termed *γορυλλαι*, being of the feminine gender, were actually the same ape which is now termed 'n'gina,' or 'n'guyla,' (*unde derivavit, fide* Burton 'gorilla') on the banks of the Gaboon. Some confusion seems to have arisen in the minds of zoologists respecting the precise import and meaning to be attached to the word 'n'tscheigo' or 'engeco,' applied to the chimpanzee. It has been alleged that this word is of native origin. Philological researches, however, cast doubt on this deduction. We think the conjecture very probable, that the early Spanish voyagers, who, under the Portuguese flag, visited the Gaboon in the 15th and 16th centuries, were eye-witnesses to the existence of two species of anthropoid apes. The larger was the n'gina or gorilla; the smaller one, the species which we now name 'chimpanzee,' the Spanish sailor would term *el chico*, 'the little one.' The transition of the negro mouth from the diminutive *el chico* to *engeco*, or *n'scheigo*, is obvious. However this may be, we have the undisputed fact that in the year 1625, at the time of Battell, the distinction of the two apes into gorilla and chimpanzee was as marked as in the present day.

It is highly creditable to the state of English knowledge that such a work as that of Tyson should have been published at the end of the 17th century; and the honour of the first

monograph on the subject is due to this writer. Sixty years afterwards, our Swedish neighbours, who had followed in the steps of Tulpinus, Bontius, and Aldrovandus, revived the absurd statements of their predecessors, and produced illustrative proofs, in which (for example) the *Lucifer Aldrovandi* was represented with the finely-turned calves and graceful ankles peculiar to the human species. The same artistic laxity which gave to all the representations of the negro races of Senegal and Congo the physiognomy of Englishmen, Frenchmen, or Spaniards, equally prevailed in the figures presented of the anthropoid apes.

The first living specimen, however, of a true anthropoid, whose aspect should have led the continental naturalists to consider the absurdity of the representations which they continued to publish for a century afterwards, was that which Tulpinus portrays in 1641, from a specimen sent to Holland as a present to Frederick Henry Prince of Orange. Afterwards, in the time of Buffon, the progress of discovery, under the auspices of the French Government, enabled that great naturalist to study a living specimen of the chimpanzee, and about the same time an adult specimen of the gibbon (*Hylobates lar*) was described by him. The progress of our knowledge of these great forms of life since that period has been vast, and numerous specimens enrich the museums of Europe. The Dutch naturalists, Camper and Vosmaer, produced valuable memoirs on the oran-ûtan in 1778-9. Baron von Wurmb was the first traveller who published accurate observations on the oran-ûtan in its adult state, which he termed pongo, adopting the name used previously for the African form, and derived from the nation (the Mpongwé) in whose vicinity the great black ape was first observed. Erroneous observations led some French zoologists to erect the pongo of Borneo into a genus distinct from the oran-ûtan. Later and more correct facts, ascertained by Owen, demonstrated the complete identity of Wurmb's pongo with the adult oran-ûtan, and revealed to us the existence of a smaller Bornean form; while the progress of commercial and missionary enterprise in equatorial Africa has led to the discovery of those remarkable forms—the gorilla, the baldheaded ape, the koolocamba, which have recently, through the labours of Dr. Savage and Du Chaillu, become even popularly familiar to us.

The sum of our knowledge of the geographical distribution of the anthropoid apes may be epitomised in the following propositions:—In Western Africa there are two species of *Trogl-*

dytes, the gorilla (*Troglodytes gorilla*) and the n'scheigo, or chimpanzee (*T. niger*). Well-marked varieties of the second form have been obtained from the neighbourhood of the Gaboon; one with a bald head, the nest-building n'scheigo m'bouvé (*T. niger* var. *calvus*), and one which, in the shape of the ears and the frontal development, at first sight seems more than any other ape to resemble man (*T. niger* var. *koqlocamba*).

In the Asiatic Archipelago are also found two distinct forms. The oran-ùtan (*Pithecus satyrus*), of which there are varieties termed 'mias-pappan,' 'mias-rambi,' and others; this species is found in Borneo and Sumatra. There is also a smaller form in Borneo, the mias-kassar (*Pithecus morio*), differing from the larger species in the relatively small size of the canine teeth.

At least eight or nine species of the long-armed ape, or gibbon (*Hyllobates*), have been discovered in Hindustan, in Transgangeitic India, and the Malay Archipelago. The northern limit of the genus is vaguely defined.

It has been sought to draw a parallel between the measurements of the crania of the anthropoid apes and the measurements of the skull in those races of mankind coincident with them in geographical distribution. Thus, it is said that the chimpanzee is *dolichocephalic* (long-headed), so is the negro; the orang is *brachycephalic* (short-headed), so is also the Malay. To the transmutationist the hypothesis seemed captivating and probable; but unfortunately it is not confirmed by the test of comparison. When the adult skulls of the chimpanzee and oran-ùtan are compared, the African form is certainly longer than its Asiatic rival; but in order to form a just comparison, the skulls of the young should be placed side by side. In the young gorilla, chimpanzee, and oran-ùtan, of the same age, the transverse diameter of the skull is proportionately equal, and if there is any difference in breadth, it is in favour of the gorilla, which is coincident in its geographical distribution with whole nations of dolichocephalic or long-headed negroes.

The distribution of the fossil forms of monkey, from which man may be supposed to claim a genetic relation, entirely baffles our attempts to associate the existing races of man with any of the species beneath him. In the Asiatic Archipelago, the land of the orang, no evidence whatever of any fossil monkey has yet been obtained; in Africa, the metropolis of chimpanzeedom, again the quadrumanous type of past ages is absent. At the antipodes, where the human race has reached its lowest level, whether by elevation or degradation, and where the besotted Australian savage grovels on, unconscious of most of those mental processes which have been thought to be dis-

tinctive of humanity, and where man's physical structure approaches nearest to that of the inferior mammals, no monkeys exist, either in a recent or fossil state.

The remarkable abnormal variations which sometimes occur in the physical structure of man, often seem to approach the forms of the same organ in the lower animals. In the lowest races of man especially, we often find forms which have led speculative zoologists to infer community of descent for the African negro, the Australian, and the ape. Thus, in the upper jaw, the outer fangs of the second molar in the chimpanzee are double; they are so constantly in the Australian; the European has more commonly one external fang. The same proposition applies to the third molar, with the exception that the typical European implantation by one fang, is, on the testimony of the best observers, peculiar to that race, and has never been observed in the Australian. In one European cranium, an indication has been observed of a fifth or posterior tubercle in the second molar of the lower jaw; but this ape-like conformation has been frequently observed in the negroes of Senegal, where the last or wisdom tooth develops often five or even six tubercles. The degree of constancy of this phenomenon in the Ethiopian races is, however, yet unascertained. One of England's most philosophical anatomists, Dr. Humphry, says:—

‘The inferior races of mankind exhibit proportions which are in many respects intermediate between the higher, or European, orders, and the monkeys. In the negro, for instance, the stature is less than the European. The cranium, as is well known, bears a small proportion to the face. Of the extremities, the upper are proportionately longer, and there is in both upper and lower a less marked preponderance of the proximal over the distal segments. For instance, in the negro, the thigh and arm are rather shorter than in the European; the leg is actually of equal length in both races, and is therefore relatively a little longer in the negro; the fore arm in the latter is actually, as well as relatively, a little longer; the foot is $\frac{1}{3}$, and the hand $\frac{1}{2}$, longer than in the European. It is well known that the foot is less well formed in the negro than in the European. The arch of the instep, the perfect conformation of which is essential to steadiness and ease of gait, is less elevated in the former than in the latter. The foot is thereby rendered flatter, as well as longer, more nearly resembling the monkeys, between which and the European there is a marked difference in this particular.’*

Dr. Büchner has put this argument in the most striking form. After reciting the physiological differences with care,

* Humphry, *Treatise on the Human Skeleton*, p. 91.

he says, that the disgusting odour, the uncleanness, the making of grimaces whilst speaking, the clear shrill tone of the voice, and the apelike character of the whole being, are just so many characteristic signs, which, in all the corporeal forms and relations of the negro, unmistakeably show the most decided approach to the monkey genus. While observers of this high mental rank deliberately express such opinions as these, comparative anatomists often find that those structures by which Man has been separated from lower forms, reappear in the inferior mammalia. Thus the 'mastoid' processes have been said to be peculiar to the human species, beautiful adaptations to the erect position of man, because those powerful muscles which aid in preserving the head upright, are attached to this structure. So far as this arrangement of muscles is coincident with the erect position of man, it is an admirable provision for that purpose. The gorilla has a slight development of the true mastoid process; the chimpanzee and the oran-utan, in which the erect position is more seldom assumed, do not offer any vestiges of the structure. In the descending scale of tailed guenons (*Cercopithecus*), the mastoid process is undeveloped. When, however, we examine the basal portion of the skull, in the large dog-headed baboons (*Cynocephalus*), we find that the mastoid process in size almost equals that of the gorilla. In all the skulls of *Cynocephalus* which we have as yet examined, a true 'mastoid' process is more or less visible. In the mandrills (*Papio*), in which the weight of the head would *à priori* seem to require an equal provision of osseous support for the muscular structure as in the *Cynocephali*, we have failed to detect any sign of the mastoid. We have no doubt that those detailed investigations which zoologists will hereafter institute into the bony structure of the order *Quadrumana*, will recall to us many similar and unaccountable abnormalities of structure. Our present experience of the *Quadrumanous* order is however extremely limited. According to Wagner, there were 210 species known in 1852, and the number cannot now be computed at less than 250. Not one-fifth of these have hitherto been subjected to accurate anatomical examination.

That man should be absolutely identical, both in his physical structure and the psychological results of structural organisation with the beasts of the field—that his direct ancestor should have been like the howling brute of the Gaboon, and his collateral relation another and more degraded Bornean form—is the great doctrine of which Professor Huxley, in England, is the chief apostle. And he appears to have adopted this opinion in con-

junction with Mr. Darwin's theory of developement by natural selection, to which he was, if we mistake not, but a short time ago, not less vehemently opposed. But in truth there is less of novelty than is commonly supposed in these views. By far the most philosophical work which has been produced by the transmutative school is that which proceeded from the pen of J. J. Virey.* His argument, however, in favour of the transmutability (under adequate conditions, according to the Lamarckian hypothesis) of the orang or chimpanzee into the negro, may be taken as the archetype ('common plan and pattern') from which Professor Huxley has derived his chief arguments. Virey alleges that we pass insensibly from the man to the ape by gradual shades. To those who point to the vast psychical gulf between the two species, the French doctor replied that there is no vast difference between the intelligence of a Bojesman and that of an oran-ûtan, and that the difference is far greater between Descartes or Homer and the Hottentot than between the stupid Hottentot and the ape. The French naturalist then proceeded to allege that the degraded state of the African negro is to a certain extent induced by the distribution of the apes in the Old World, of which the fiercest and most obscene forms are peculiar to Africa; and he contrasts these African forms of ape with the Asiatic species, characterised by greater mildness and a higher degree of acquired docility. The idea of the coincidence and derivation of the races of man with and from various species of ape has been taken up with greater vigour by succeeding naturalists. Agassiz † has remarked on the singularity of 'the fact that the black orang occurs upon that continent ' which is inhabited by the black human race, while the brown ' orang inhabits those parts of Asia over which the chocolate-coloured Malays have been developed.' Unless, however, the European races are made to claim descent from the oran-ûtan (although the gorilla would, *à priori*, seem to be far more nearly allied to man), this theory leaves us entirely in the dark as to their origin. Neither does it account for the genesis of the Australian negroes, as there is not only no black ape, but no ape at all, within that continent which could furnish hypothetical zoologists with a convenient progenitor.

The present state of accurate scientific thought in England, with reference to the theory of Mr. Darwin, falls exceedingly short of entire and unmixed assent. In nearly every case in which the assumptions of Darwinism with respect to the operation

* Histoire Naturelle du Genre Humain, 3 vols. 8vo. Paris: 1824.

† Agassiz, 'Christian Examiner,' Boston (U.S.), July, 1850.

of the 'selective' law have been fairly tested, the result has been their rejection. Under these circumstances Professor Huxley's unqualified 'selection' of Mr. Darwin's hypothesis as the only one which has any scientific existence, is not warranted by the true state of the case. Although Mr. Darwin's theory is supported by the most ingenious argument, worthy of its distinguished and deservedly-respected author, which has yet been offered in favour of transmutation, we still hold it to be entirely inconclusive. Nor do we think that the general theory of development has gained anything from Professor Huxley's attempt to apply it to the relations of man to those creatures which are supposed to stand next to him in the order of the creation.

What, then, is the real organic difference between Man and the apes? Professor Huxley endeavours to show 'that no absolute structural line of demarcation wider than that between the animals which immediately succeed us in the scale can be drawn between the animal world and ourselves; and I may add the expression of my belief that the attempt to draw a psychological distinction is equally futile, and that even the highest faculties of feeling and of intellect begin to germinate in the lower forms of life.' The great toe, the third lobe, the posterior cornu, the *hippocampus minor*, vanish as differential tests. The only test which he can discover is that 'man alone possesses the marvellous endowment of intelligible and rational speech, whereby, in the secular period of his existence, he has slowly accumulated and organised the experience which is almost wholly lost with the cessation of every individual life in other animals.' And he elsewhere alleges that 'the possession of articulate speech is the grand distinctive character of man (whether it be absolutely peculiar to him or not).' But even this characteristic may be unsatisfactory as a test of zoological classification. No one who examines carefully the linguistic phenomena afforded by some of the inferior animals will deny that the domestic dog or cat possesses the power to a certain extent of expressing its emotions by semi-articulate or modulated sounds. The nicety with which some of the most delicate shades of entreasy, anger, desire, hunger, love of approbation, fear, or pleasure, are expressed by birds and beasts is familiar to every one; the crucial test which Professor Huxley has selected is inaccurate. What he means, apparently, is not merely articulate speech, but language. To utter articulate sounds is not necessarily an act of reason, for a parrot does it; but to marshal these sounds by syntax, and to inform them with inflections of meaning, is the attribute of Man.

Professor Huxley, seeking to overthrow the zoological ordinal distinction between twohanded and twofooted man and fourhanded monkeys, alleges that, in the characters afforded by an examination of the extremities, man in all cases is much nearer to the gorilla than the gorilla to the lowest quadrumanæ, the lemur. To this entirely illogical fallacy we would devote a few words. We know that there is a certain community of organisation between the various members of the class *Mammalia*. We see the brain rising by slow and gradual steps of ascending development through changes, the progress of which can be traced in the successive stages afforded by the rat, the sheep, the lion, the monkey, and the man. When we analyse particularly the exact significance of these successive changes, we see that in the order *Quadrumana* there is a certain range of progressive increment in the ratio of development of the various brains. We may roughly say that the brains of the *Quadrumana* increase in development and complication through the series indicated in the arithmetical terms, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and that the human brain may be represented by the term 15. Of course a controversialist may assert that the number 10 (gorilla) is nearer the term 15 (man) than is the number 1 (lemur), the respective differences being 5 and 9. But the fact remains that between the gorilla and the lemur there is a series of well-defined but short steps; between the gorilla and man no intervening link has as yet been discovered. This, we apprehend, is the true aspect of the question; and, until zoology or geology shall have demonstrated to us the existence of intervening links, we are justified in placing man, as he is at present, in a separate sub-class. The question is, whether the anatomical differences between man and the highest ape (gorilla) are greater or less than between the second and third links (gorilla and chimpanzee) in the descending scale, or between any two successive links in the quadrumanous series. Professor Huxley plunges from the gorilla down to the lemur, and puts forward the difference between the brains and feet of these extremes of the series as a proposition equivalent in value to the difference between the brains and feet of the gorilla and negro.

With the view, moreover, of disparaging that manifest distinction by which the foot of man is enabled to implant itself firmly on the earth, while his hands are capable of the most delicate manipulation, Professor Huxley rakes up those semi-fabulous anecdotes which are found in the works of obscure travellers, in which a certain amount of opposability of the great toe, or homologue of the thumb, is alleged to be possessed

by a few individuals in a few races of man. We venture, however, to deny the alleged fact, and we dispute the inference which Professor Huxley attempts to draw from it.

Professor Huxley says that

‘The civilised great toe, confined and cramped from childhood upwards, is seen to a great disadvantage, and that in uncivilised and barefooted people it retains a great amount of mobility, and even some sort of opposability. The Chinese boatmen are said to be able to pull an oar; the artisans of Bengal to weave; and the Carajas to stem fishhooks by its help; though, after all, it must be recollected that the structure of its joints, and the arrangements of its bones, necessarily render its prehensile action far less perfect than that of the thumb.’

This passage gives a totally erroneous notion of the amount of opposability which is possible in the thumb of a few of the lower races of mankind. Whatever truth there may be in such narratives as these, or in those which allege that the Abyssinian horsemen support the stirrup between the great toe and the second toe; or that some of the Indians of Central America conceal small pieces of gold under their toes, and then silyly uplifting their feet, hide the product in their clothing, there is one important objection to be made, which was originally suggested by M. Pruner-Bey. He has told us that a shortening of the great toe, often combined with its slight divarication from the other toes, has been noted in the negro, in some Malay races and amongst the Hottentots, as a constant feature assimilating these nations to the ape. The French anatomist, however, places the question before us in this manner:—‘Is there any muscle, or even any aponeurotic tendon, which coordinates this alleged function?’ The answer is explicit. The human hand differs from the human foot inasmuch as there is a special muscle (*opponens pollicis*) the function of which is to oppose the thumb to the other fingers. This muscle originates from the *trapezium*, or innermost carpal bone of the thumb. If we turn to the human foot, and examine the answerable bones, we see neither on the under surface of the bone which we term *entocuneiforme*, nor on the metatarsal bone of the great toe, any such surface for the attachment of muscle. This is the true difference between the human foot and the human hand—a difference which Professor Huxley entirely passes over. The value of the difference every reader will see; the hand has a structure by which its internal digit or thumb can be opposed to the other digits; the foot has no such power of opposability in its great toe. Granted that the hinder extremity of the gorilla is formed by bones homologous with those of the human

foot—granted that the tarsal bones ‘in all important circumstances of number, disposition, and form resemble those of ‘man’—nevertheless, the fact of the hind thumb, or hallex, being functionally opposable in the gorilla is to us decisive of the question. But neither in the foot of the Chinese boatmen, nor in that of the pilfering Caraja, can the anatomist perceive anything which approaches to a developement of any opponent muscle, by which the great toe can be converted functionally into the semblance of a thumb. In addition to this structure, the grasping power of the foot of the gorilla and orang is strengthened in a very peculiar manner. Every anatomist knows that the muscle termed *flexor longus pollicis pedis* originates from the lower portion of the outer bone of the leg or *fibula*, and that its solitary tendon passes along the sole of the foot, and is eventually inserted into the base of the last joint of the great toe. The whole force of the muscle is here concentrated; and the dancer who pirouettes on tiptoe exhibits a striking example of the power and force of this muscle in man. When we turn, however, to the foot of the orang, a totally different structure presents itself. The homologous muscle there is terminated in three tendons, each of which is inserted in one of the three middle toes, forming a grasping organ, wherewith the orang ascends the highest trees in Borneo. Professor Owen remarks on this structure—

‘It is surely asking too much to require us to believe that in the course of time, under any circumstances, these three tendons should become consolidated into one, and that one become implanted into a toe to which none of the three separate tendons were before attached. The myology of the orangs, to which I may hereafter endeavour to direct more attention than it has yet received, affords many arguments, equally unanswerable, against the possibility of their transmutation into a higher race of beings.’

When we turn to the gorilla, the homologous muscle divides into three slips—the first and smallest is attached to the third joint of the great toe, the second slip is attached to the third joint of the third toe, and the third slip is attached to the third joint of the fourth toe. It will be obviously seen that the second and third slips in the gorilla have no direct representative in man. They are essentially climbing, and not standing, muscles. Should we think that the representatives of the second and third slips have become atrophied in man, and the power transferred to the great toe, we may ask, on the operation of that law which Professor Huxley terms ‘atavism,’ by which is meant a reversion of the character of the animal back to the primeval character of its long extinct progenitors, why

there is not on the part of the scansorial members of the human family a reversion towards the toe character of their baboon ancestors? Why do not the climbing sailors, whose immediate ancestors have gone aloft by the shrouds for generation after generation in our scaports, revert by 'atavism,' and exhibit in their prehensile feet the trifurcated muscle, *longus pollicis pedis*, of the gorilla? We can well imagine, on the Darwinian hypothesis, how such a favoured race would, if once fairly started, supplant their flat-footed rivals, and ultimately, by the selective process, reign the sole tenants of the rigging. But neither in the sailor, the acrobat, the bark-stripper of Aquitaine, nor the negro who climbs the palm tree of Senegal, do we find any trace of the retention of a structure which, if present, would materially aid him in his daily efforts to obtain food. When, however, we examine these theories seriously, when we test them by the common facts which are placed before the practical anatomist every day of his life, we are forced to reject entirely any idea of the application of the law of Natural Selection to the alteration of such structures as the human foot.

It must now form part of our task to comment on the leading modifications of the cerebrum in the *Quadrumana*, in the six families into which they are divided by Professor Huxley under the order *Primates*. The lowest is the *Cheiromyini*, of which the solitary example is the Aye Aye. In this species, two-thirds of the cerebellum are left exposed by the cerebrum. There is no trace of any posterior horn, or of any contained *hippocampus minor*. The 'middle horn' answers to the definition of 'cornu descendens'; instead of projecting backwards, it sinks down directly into the sphenoidal 'lobe,' or 'natiform' protuberance of the cerebrum. The 'calcarine sulcus' is absent. In the next family, the *Galeopithecini*, or flying lemur, our information respecting the brain is of the most fragmentary character, and we have no trustworthy data to guide us. Next we come to the true lemurs. In the *Galago* (*Otolicnus*), Mr. Flower has demonstrated that a cavity or fissure exists, extending backwards almost to the extremity of the cerebral hemisphere. The floor and inner wall of this are raised into a prominence, corresponding to a calcarine sulcus beneath. This prominence Mr. Flower considers to be the 'hippocampus minor.' This opinion is accompanied by a remarkable admission. He attaches a note to his elaborate description, expressing a doubt 'whether the above-named cavity in the posterior lobe existed before dissection, the length of time which it had been 'in spirit having greatly facilitated this process.' If this should prove to be the case, Mr. Flower considers 'that it will justify

'the statement of the absence of hippocampus minor by anatomists who have looked at this structure only in its relation to 'the posterior cornu.' A large portion of the cerebellum is left uncovered in the galago. When we examine the next genus, *Stenops*, there we see that Vrolik found no trace whatever of the hippocampus minor, nor have we any evidence of the presence of a posterior horn. The cerebral lobes here leave the cerebellum uncovered. In the little tarsier, in which also the cerebellum is partially uncovered, a very long fissure extends into the so-called 'posterior lobe.' This fissure is, however, significantly different from the admittedly homologous structure in man; the walls are, as in *Otolincus*, adherent together, there not being the slightest vacuity offered in which ventricular fluid could be contained. Vieq d'Azir* declares that the posterior horn is entirely absent in the *Lemur macaoca*.

The next modification of the brain in *Quadrumana* is that of the *Arctopithecini* (marmosets, tamarins). The tips of the posterior cerebral lobe here project far beyond the cerebellum, as in all the lowest forms of American *Quadrumana*. The cornu posterius is, however, but a slender fissure, and the presence of the hippocampus minor, homologous with the organ in man, is hitherto undemonstrated. The drawing of the brain of *Hapale* in Mr. Flower's † memoir advantageously contrasts with the 'diagrammatic representations' which other and less accurate anatomists, ‡ have made. When, however, we examine the brain of the little marmoset, and mark the difference between the slender pointed posterior cerebral lobe in the *Hapale* and in Man, the true differences become strikingly manifest. The same range of variation is also present in the *Cebi* and *Ateles* of South America. The howler monkey (*Myctes*) presents one of the most characteristic cerebral forms; and in face of our present state of ignorance respecting South American monkeys, we are not entitled to say how far it may not be typical of a number of species. The occipital foramen is, as admitted by Professor Huxley, situated completely in the posterior face of the skull. This has the effect of leaving a large proportion of the cerebellum exposed, when we take the base line of the skull as defined by Professor Huxley as the horizontal line.

* (Œuvres complètes, Description anatomique des Singes, t. v. p. 314.

† Phil. Tran., 1862, Plate iii. Fig. 9.

‡ Med. Times and Gazette, 1862, vol. i. p. 182.

Turning to the monkeys of the Old World, our knowledge of the brain of *Cynocephalus* is founded on the researches of Leuret. In that genus, as in the marmosets, the slender acuminate cerebral lobes project beyond the cerebellum. Their large development, proportionately to that of the allied forms, was, we believe, first brought prominently before an English audience by Professor Owen, in the catalogue of the Hunterian Museum (p. 34.). In France, this fact was afterwards demonstrated by Gratiolet. The bulk of the posterior lobe, however, is ~~far~~ inferior to that in the human species.

In the valuable memoir which M. Camille Dareste contributed 'Sur les Circonvolutions du Cerveau chez les Mammifères,' which was presented to the Academy of Sciences of Paris on the 26th March 1855, is figured a most accurate representation of the brain of the magot (*Leontideus sylvanus*.) In this figure the cerebral hemispheres do not extend further beyond the cerebellum than in the little tamarin. Unlike, however, that species, they leave a large portion of the cerebellum uncovered between them. The well-known accuracy of the observations of M. Camille Dareste entirely precludes the supposition that in his case he figured this brain from a specimen in bad condition, or one which had been subjected to *affaissement*, or posthumous alteration. The length of the posterior lobes in the *Macaci* is vaguely defined. They are, however, coextensive with the cerebellum. According to Mr. Flower, 'in adult examples, the walls of the posterior cornu adhere very closely.' In the higher genus *Cercopithecus*, the cerebral hemispheres are coextensive with, and even in some species project over, the cerebellum. With respect to the brains of the intervening forms, *Presbytis*, *Hylobates*, &c., our information is not complete; at the same time, our thanks are due to Mr. W. H. Flower for the ability and lucidity with which he has put before us the facts at his disposal. The *miaskassar* (*Pithecius morio*) has never yet been adequately and scientifically described, as regards its cerebral structure. We shall intentionally pass over all inaccurate or unduly partial descriptive details which may have been from time to time put forth, and, with a sense of relief, turn to the descriptions of the brain of the larger orang, which have been recently elaborated by Messrs. Schröder van der Kolk and Vrolik, and by Mr. W. H. Flower. The first writers state that in this orang 'the posterior or occipital lobe does not project so far as that of Man; it does not cover the cerebellum so perfectly, at least it does not hide it completely, especially laterally.' In the brain which Mr. Flower dissected, 'the posterior lobes were seen to project exactly as far back-

'ward as completely to cover the cerebellum, but not to extend 'beyond it.' With respect to the internal structure of the brain, we shall consider this further, when alluding to the generalisations which Professor Huxley has offered on the subject.

Our knowledge of the brain of the chimpanzee (*Troglodytes niger*) still leaves much to be desired. The accounts and representations which have been made of it all rest upon the examination of adolescent or very young specimens, in which the ventricles are proportionately larger than in the adult. This criticism applies both to the inaccurate figures given by Tyson and Macartney, and to the elaborate and careful descriptions with which we have been favoured by Tiedemann, Schröder van der Kolk, Vrolik, Gratiolet, and Professor John Marshall.* The last-named observer, especially, has contributed the most valuable monograph on the brain of the chimpanzee yet before us. We observe, however, that his measurements show most distinctly that the posterior lobes in man project far more than in the chimpanzee, the proportion being as 1 (man) to .83 (chimpanzee.) The absolute amount of overlap is greater in man, being $\frac{1}{10}$ inch, and in the chimpanzee $\frac{5}{10}$ inch; relatively, however, the proportional overlap, taking Professor Marshall's base line as correct, is greatest in the chimpanzee, being about $\frac{1}{9}$ of the total cerebral length, while in man the proportion is $\frac{1}{11}$ inch. As in the case of the orang-utan, we shall postpone our criticism of the internal structure.

The cast of the brain cavity of the gorilla lies before us as we write. On comparing its proportions with those of man, the prevailing differences which strike the observer are—the flattened and narrow frontal lobe, the rounded and smooth sphenoidal lobe, or 'natiform' protuberance; and above all the absence of cerebral projection over the cerebellum. Taking the basi-cranial line as proposed by Huxley, or one parallel with it, the cerebellum is seen to project beneath the cerebrum for at least one-eighth of an inch; taking a line drawn from the glabella to the posterior margin of the foramen magnum as the base line (the natural position of the brain during the life of the animal), a much larger proportion of the cerebellum is visible. On either method of measurement, it cannot be said that the cerebrum in the gorilla projects beyond the cerebellum. With respect to the other controverted points, it must be borne in mind that we have not yet any information respecting the internal structure of the brain of the most manlike ape. The

* Nat. Hist. Rev., 1861, p. 26.

specimens which Gratiolet and Owen have both dissected were severally in the most decayed and perishable condition. We can but hope that the perseverance of some energetic traveller, endowed with the same physical stamina, zeal for scientific discovery and truth, which has distinguished Captain R. F. Burton in his valuable researches, may enable us ere long to rectify our knowledge of the brain of the gorilla. We would further remark, that to such a traveller alone, will the discovery be due of that 'missing link,' if any such exist, which, according to the aspirations of the transmutationist, may disclose still more clearly the affinity between the negro and the ape of Equatorial Africa.

The fact being reluctantly admitted that the cerebral lobes in the gorilla are coextensive with the cerebellum, and no more, it has been endeavoured to show that this anthropoid ape is not really the species nearest akin to Man. Upon the allegation broadly made, that in the chimpanzee the convolutions correspond more closely to the human type, has been based another assumption, that that species, and not the gorilla, is the one most nearly allied to Man. The place of the gorilla in nature has thus been degraded by unsystematic naturalists to the level of the baboons; as the zoologists of forty years ago, somewhat for the same reason, classed their imaginary pongo with the *Cynocephali*. But those who are acquainted with the osteological structure of the gigantic ape of West Africa will have no doubt whatever of its higher affinities. The presence of mastoid and styloid processes, the developement of the heelbone, and the form of the pelvis, raise the gorilla far above the chimpanzee. Even if we place it elsewhere, we cannot recognise either its affinity or analogy with the baboons. The lower forms, with the vertebræ of their loins so firmly interlocked together, with the cerebral mass of the brain compressed within such a small chamber, and associated with such a powerful dentary apparatus, assuredly bear no relation whatever to the ape of the Gaboon.

From a review of the above facts, as well as those at which we have arrived after a prolonged examination of the cerebral characters of the *Quadrumana*, we consider ourselves entitled to draw the following conclusions:—

1. That in some *Quadrumana* (*Gorilla*, *Myocetes*) the cerebellum is uncovered to a certain proportion of its extent; that in others (*Troglodytes*, *Pithecius*, *Macacus*, *Inuus*, *Midas*), the cerebral lobes are coextensive with the cerebellum; that in *Cercopithecus*, *Cynocephalus*, *Cebus*, *Chrysothrix*, they project slightly beyond it. That in no ape is the portion which projects

beyond the cerebellum in any degree equal in bulk or substance to the far larger structure which is termed the posterior lobe of man.

2. That the lowest lemurs exhibit no posterior cornu; that in *Tarsius* a slender ventricular fissure exists, as well as in the marmosets; in the Sapajous, our information as yet is scanty and often inaccurate; but in the Old World *Quadrumanæ*, from *Macacus* to *Cercopithecus* there is no indication of any cavity in the posterior lobe answering to the posterior cornu in man, or greater in extent than the 'scrobiculus parvus' of Tiedmann, or the 'actual or potential cavity' described by Flower*: that in the higher apes, *Troglodytes*, *Pithecius*, the posterior cavity of the tricornuate ventricle becomes of larger dimensions than in *Cercopithecus*, although far inferior in size and diverse in shape, from the much deeper, and more incurved cornuate bay which forms the digital cavity of man.

3. That the structure termed hippocampus minor, taking it in the sense in which the term is used by human anatomists, is, strictly speaking, absent in all *Quadrumanæ*, in none of which is there, that characteristic inversion of the grey cortical brain matter, coincident in its direction with the floor of the posterior cornu, which forms the hippocampus minor of anthropotomy.

The state of the literature of the classification of Mammalia in 1857 led Professor Owen to propound a new system of arrangement, primarily based on the ascensive steps of cerebral modification observed. Thus, mammals were divided into the four subclasses, *Lyencephala*, *Lisencephala*, *Gyrencephala*, and *Archencephala* — the platypus and the opossum being examples of the first subclass; the rat, mole, bat, and armadillo, of the second; the whale, dugong, toxodon, elephant, rhinoceros, ox, lion, and ape, representing the third; and man alone being comprised in the fourth division. The cerebral character of the *Gyrencephala* were thus defined by Professor Owen, in his memoir:— 'The third leading modification of the Mammalian cerebrum is such an increase in its relative size that it extends over more or less of the cerebellum, and generally more or less of the olfactory lobes. Save in very few exceptional cases of the smaller and inferior forms of *Quadrumanæ*, the superficies is folded into more or less numerous gyri or convolutions, whence the name *Gyrencephala*, which I propose for the third subclass of Mammalia.' In this memoir, the brains of the small Tamarin monkey, *Midas rufimanus*, and of the

* Phil. Trans., 1862, p. 193. Pl. iii. Fig. 7.

chimpanzee, were figured: the first, from Professor Owen's original dissection, was intended to illustrate the average degree of extension of the cerebrum over the cerebellum in *Quadrumana*; the second, from Schröder van der Kolk's important paper on the 'anatomy of the chimpanzee, was destined to exhibit the general arrangements of the cerebral gyri and convolutions in the *Quadrumana*. The proportions of the cerebral projection in this brain were defectively illustrated: the cerebrum having slid forward after death, and left a large proportion of the cerebellum exposed. As, however, the average quadrumanous projections of this cerebral lobe were illustrated in the figure of the tamarin's brain, this defect was one for which Messrs. Schröder van der Kolk and Vrolik were solely responsible; and as they still adhere to the statement, '*Nous reconnaissons avec M. Owen, que ces dessins sont exacts,*' the criticism of Professor Huxley, that Owen has 'misused their authority,' appear to be based upon a misconception of his opponent's argument.

The fourth and last modification of the brain in *Mammalia* is that of the *Archencephala*. As Professor Huxley* has published what, to use the mildest term, must be deemed an inaccurate version of the original definition by his antagonist, we make no excuse for transcribing it at length from the 'Journal of the Linnean Society' (vol. ii. p. 19.):—

'In man the brain presents an ascensive step in developement, higher and more strongly marked than that by which the preceding sub-class was distinguished from the one below it. Not only do the cerebral hemispheres* overlap the olfactory lobes and cerebellum, but they extend in advance of the one and further back than the other. Their posterior developement is so marked that anatomists have assigned to that part the character of a third lobe; it is peculiar to the genus *Homo*, and equally peculiar is the "posterior horn of the lateral ventricle" and the hippocampus minor which characterise the hind lobe of each hemisphere. The superficial grey matter of the cerebrum, through the number and depth of the convolutions, attains its maximum of extent in *Man*. Peculiar mental powers are associated with this highest form of brain and their consequences wonderfully illustrate the value of the cerebral character; according to my estimate of which, I am led to regard the genus *Homo*, as not merely a representative of a distinct order but of a distinct sub-class of the *Mammalia* for which I propose the name of *Archencephala*.'

Professor Huxley states —

'At the meeting of the British Association at Oxford, in 1860, Professor Owen repeated these assertions in my presence, and of

* *Natural Hist. Review*, 1861, p. 71.

course, I immediately gave them a direct and unqualified contradiction, pledging myself to justify that statement elsewhere.'

The following counter-propositions were afterwards made by him* :—

'That the third lobe is neither peculiar to, nor characteristic of Man, seeing that it exists in all the higher *Quadrumana*. That the posterior cornu of the lateral ventricle is neither peculiar to, nor characteristic of Man, inasmuch as it also exists in the higher *Quadrumana*. That the hippocampus minor is neither peculiar to, nor characteristic of Man, as it is found in certain of the higher *Quadrumana*.'

We shall proceed to criticise the actual and logical value of these counter-statements of Professors Owen and Huxley in detail; observing that the proposition laid down by Professor Owen by no means implied the negation of the existence of rudiments of the structures in question in other animals than man.

It has been sought to prove, and it has been more than once repeated, that Professor Owen has advocated the proposition that the whole of the cerebellum is uncovered in the *Quadrumana*, and that he has stated that the ventricular cavity in these apes is biradial and two-horned, as in the dog. Such an assertion has on no occasion, to our knowledge, been made by the learned Professor. The degree of projection of the cerebral hemispheres over the cerebellum in the lowest monkeys of South America was originally defined by him in a memoir contributed to the Royal Society in 1837; and the whole scope of his public teaching, so far as we are acquainted with it, has involved the recognition in the highest *Gyrencephala* of organs admittedly homologous with those of man, but differing from the structure of the highest mammal by their minor degree of developement and their less amount of complexity. At the same time it would have been more consistent with his own dignity and with the interests of science to have admitted any real inaccuracy, or to have explained any apparent inaccuracy, which may have escaped him; but we are by no means satisfied that any real inaccuracy exists, if the terms of the question are clearly stated.

The older anatomists, whose support Professor Huxley claims, who employed such terms as '*scrobiculus*,' '*pes hippocampi minor*,' '*indice du petit pied d'hippocampe*,' '*aanduiding van den kleinen vogelkluauw*,' rightly appreciated the true signification of these structures. The most scrupulous care was exercised by them, in order to exclude the idea which it has been the

* Nat. Hist. Rev., 1861, p. 67. and seq.

fashion recently so much to advocate, that the ape's brain possesses the disputed structure to a greater extent than in man. A most elaborate argument has been offered, with a view to explain away the fact, that Tiedemann, in 1821, termed the indication of the posterior cornu in the pigtailed monkey (*Macacus nemestrinus*), a small furrow in lieu of the hinder horn (*scrobiculus parvus loco cornu posterioris*). Further evidence of Tiedemann's experience in the brains of pigtailed monkeys is not vouchsafed, but it is sedulously put before us, that Tiedemann, in 1826, during the long course of his cerebral investigations, described the brain of an orang-utan, in which, as the cavity in question is admittedly greater in *Pithecus* than in *Macacus*, he used the term *cornu posterius*. And in the sense in which he employed the word, merely as expressing the recognition of the homology of the structure in the orang and in man, he was correct. But the term, in the sense in which the ape's structure is alleged to be in point of fact a structure equal in size to the development which it attains in man, is, we submit, in this case, misused to an extent wholly at variance with the facts. We apply the term 'hand' to the prehensile portion of the anterior extremity in man; and our conception of 'hand' is based upon the predominance of certain characters, e. g. the opposable thumb, peculiar to man and the *Quadrumanus*. But we apply to the structure in the lion, although confessedly composed of homologous bones as the human hand, the term 'paw;' in the ungulate herbivore, the term 'hoof;' in the pinnigrade carnivore, or seal, the term 'flipper;' and in the cetacean, the term 'paddle' are used to express organs which are homologous to the human hand. We give them distinctive names to express our idea of certain manifest structural differences; and while we recognise that the term 'manus,' or hand, is applicable to each of these structures on the ground of mere homology, the distinctive names indicative of the function of each respective modification is preferred. In like manner, the definition of the posterior cornu in the brain of man expressly declares that its direction is 'backwards, outwards, and then inwards.' On the 101st page of Professor Huxley's work, he figures the brain of man and the chimpanzee in juxtaposition, the first being taken from a specimen dissected by Mr. W. H. Flower; the second from the photograph which Professor J. Marshall gives in the 'Natural History Review.' Bearing in mind one very important fact, not stated by Professor Huxley, that the human brain here figured is that of an adult, while the chimpanzee was a young male just cutting its upper teeth (in which, of course, the ventricles were

proportionately larger), we accept the two drawings as faithful copies of the subjects after dissection. We do not fail to observe the vast differences between the lengths of the anterior cornua in man and the ape; in the former being as .21, in the latter as .103 to 1. We see also that the posterior cornu is fractionally larger in the man. But the broad and striking difference lies not in the size, but in the proportions of the posterior horn. In man we see it worthy the name of a digital cavity (*cavité ancyroïde*), curving round, and becoming inflected behind the internal perpendicular fissure. In the ape we cannot perceive any such inflection towards the mesial line. We see that the space between the posterior end of the posterior cornu in man, and the edge of the cerebral lobes, is not more than half the length of the whole posterior horn; in the chimpanzee, this space at least equals the whole length of the hinder horn. With such differences as these patent before us, how can we term this simial structure a 'horn' when it is not cornuate, a 'digital cavity' when it is not like a finger, an 'ancyroid' bay when it is not anchor-shaped? If Professor Huxley would employ himself in inventing new terms for the structures in the inferior animals, he might confer an advantage upon science; if he will apply the terms, used by the elder zoologists, such as Tiedemann, we should consider such nomenclature most convenient; but the laws of scientific terminology, no less than of common sense, preclude the application of the terms used by our elder human anatomists to structures which bear no possible resemblance to them whatever, and are incompatible with the accepted definitions.

The degree of doubt with which the anatomists assembled in public session at Amsterdam received the statements of MM. Schröder van der Kolk and Vrolik, is highly characteristic of the love for actual facts which is innate in the Dutch mind. The brain on which these anatomists demonstrated the so-called presence of the posterior lobe, posterior cornu, and hippocampus minor in the orang, exhibited the cerebellum distinctly projecting on either side the flattened cerebral lobes. The fact was universally recognised by all the anatomists present at the meeting, and forms an amusing commentary on the statement of Professor Huxley:—'Every marmoset, American monkey, Old-world monkey, baboon, or manlike ape, on the contrary, has its cerebellum entirely hidden posteriorly by the cerebral lobes, and possesses a large posterior cornu, with a well-developed hippocampus minor' (p. 97.). The well-developed hippocampus minor of Professor Huxley, so hardily predicated in every ape, is described by Schröder van der Kolk and Vrolik as '*l'indice du*

'*petit pied d'hippocampe*,' a term which far more accurately expresses its real signification.

When Professor Owen, at Cambridge, exhibited the cast of the brain-cavity of the gorilla skull, and compared it with the cast of a human brain, from Professor Clark's museum, Professor Huxley objected to the comparison and considered it unfair. He has not, however, the same scruples when he places in juxtaposition the drawings of the internal casts of the chimpanzee and human skull, the cerebral chambers of which are exhibited in the most *distorted* manner for reciprocal comparison. Professor Huxley is forced to admit that 'the sharper definition of the lower edge of the cast of the cerebral chamber in the chimpanzee arises from the circumstance that the tentorium remained in that skull and not in the man's. The cast more accurately represents the brain in the chimpanzee than in the man.' Comparisons of this nature between two incongruous objects are detrimental to the progress of true science.

Professor Huxley excuses himself from demonstrating the presence of the *posterior cornu* and *hippocampus minor* in the apes by a dogmatical assertion not entirely consistent with what he has said of the *Mycetes* in the preceding page:—

'I do not feel bound to enter upon any discussion of these points, but content myself with assuring the reader that the posterior cornu and the hippocampus minor have now been seen — usually at least as well developed as in man, and often better — not only in the chimpanzee, the orang, and the gibbon, but in all the genera of the Old-world baboons and monkeys, and in most of the New-world forms, including the marmosets.'

At the same time, he proposes the following tests of distinction:— 'Let it be admitted, however, that the brain of man is absolutely distinguished from that of the highest known apes. 1st. By its large size, as compared with the cerebral nerves. 2nd. By the existence of the lobule of the marginal convolution. 3rd. By the absence of the external perpendicular fissure.'

We shall not here discuss these points. The first head is merely a recapitulation of the arguments of the elder anatomists, and is one which no one has ever controverted. The second and the third are not yet sufficiently proved to the satisfaction of competent anatomists.

The passage in which Professor Huxley closes his 'succinct history' we cannot pass without comment. He says:—

'Not only are the statements made by me in consonance with the doctrines of the best older authorities, and with those of all recent investigators, but I am quite ready to demonstrate them on the first monkey that comes to hand; whilst Professor Owen's assertions are

not only in diametrical opposition to both old and new authorities, but he has not produced—and, I will add, cannot produce—a single preparation which justifies them.’

‘I now leave this subject, for the present. For the credit of my calling, I should be glad to be, hereafter, for ever silent upon it. But, unfortunately, this is a matter upon which, after all that has occurred, no mistake or confusion of terms is possible; and in affirming that the posterior lobe, the posterior cornu, and the hippocampus minor, exist in certain apes, I am stating either that which is true or that which I must know to be false. The question has thus become to be one of personal veracity. For myself, I will accept no other issue than this, grave as it is, to the present controversy.’

This is not the language of good temper or good taste; and if Mr. Huxley is right in his opinion, he has done himself harm by the injudicious and offensive manner in which he has advocated it. But when he deliberately assures the British public that he is supported by the best older authorities, and we glance back over his pages, and see that the names of such men as Tiedemann*, Cruveilhier†, John Hunter, and Burmeister, adverse authorities to his conclusions, are excluded from his category of past anatomists, we are reluctantly led to the conclusion that there is more of the passion of contention than of the candour of science in his statements.

The opinion of one of England's best anatomists, the venerable and recently departed Robert Knox, was vehemently opposed to that of the modern Darwinite transmutation school. He took every opportunity of denouncing the hippocampus minor controversy as a ‘silly dispute;’ and his idea of the true question was that the great distinction between the human brain and that of vertebrate animals is, that ‘in man the posterior lobe of the cerebrum overlaps the cerebellum, whilst in other

* The words of Tiedemann, which cannot be too often quoted, are—‘*Pedes hippocampi minores, vel ungues, vel calcaria avis, quæ a posteriore corporis callosi margine tanquam processus duo medullares profisciscuntur, inque fundo cornu posterioris plicas graciles et retroflexas formant, in cerebro Simiarum desunt, nec in cerebro aliorum a me examinerum mammalium occurrunt; homini (ergo proprii sunt.)*’ (Tiedemann, *Icones Cerebri Simiarum et quorundam Mammalium rariorum*, p. 51. Folio. Heidelberg: 1821.)

† Cruveilhier, one of the best human anatomists that France ever produced, says:—‘*L'érgot (hippocampus minor) de même que la cavité digitale (posterior cornu of the lateral ventricle) n'existe guères que chez l'homme, sans doute parce que l'homme seul présente un grand développement de la partie occipitale du cerveau.*’ (Cruveilhier, *Anatomie Descriptive*, tome iv. p. 697. Paris: 1836.)

'animals (with scarcely an exception) *it does not*. But the brain 'in all mammals is formed on precisely the same plan; no parts 'have been left out.' We entirely agree with Dr. Knox in his opinion of the extreme absurdity of this quarrel; and if men of science are to impugn the veracity of others or to stake their own credit on such questions, it is at least desirable that the subject in dispute should have some real meaning. So little is known of the true functions of the different parts and organs of the brain, that we believe no one has even attempted to assign any especial purpose in the animal economy, or in the operations of the brain, to the hippocampus. Nothing is known about it; and if the distinction between men and apes rested on this difference, it would be very small indeed. We believe it to be a matter of perfect indifference to the real progress of science, and to the determination of all that is important in this controversy, whether Professor Owen or Professor Huxley is in the right on this fact; for, granting it be demonstrated either way, it leaves all the essential characteristics of men and monkeys where they were before.

Let us, before we conclude, take one more example of these structural differences.

The teeth in man offer many remarkable points of dissimilarity with those of the higher apes. The broad and striking differences, which were originally pointed out by Professor Owen, may be described as follows:—The equable development of the teeth in the human species; the absence of all sexual distinction in particular teeth; the moderate size of the incisors, canines, and premolars; the configuration of the grinding surfaces of the latter, together with their implantation by one fang in the lower jaw, and by two fangs, which are in most cases connate, in the upper; the large size of the true molars in comparison with the incisors, canines, and premolars, and the character of their grinding surfaces; the absence of break or diastema in the series; the curve formed by the molar series, including the premolars, and the parabolic arch which the entire dental series describes. It may be incidentally remarked that the fourth distinctive character is one in which the lower black races of man differ from their alleged ancestors the apes, to a greater extent than the more elevated white European races. The large size of the molar teeth in the Negro, and especially in the Australian races, is an established fact, however over-zealous advocates for the unity of the human race on dental grounds alone may attempt to explain it away by reference to occasional and exceptional cases. This very difference has the effect of placing the Australian farther from the ape than his

white brother. The fifth difference we do not consider of much classificatory value, as individuals are frequently discovered of both species of *Oran-utan*, in which no break exists in the series of teeth in the lower jaw. The sixth difference prevails in the majority of human skulls; however, a specimen in the collection of the Royal College of Surgeons of an exceedingly degraded Australian skull exhibits a remarkable departure from the parabolic curve of man's organ of speech. It must be borne in mind that in the very young apes before the great development of the canine teeth has, so to say, squared the jaws, the curve formed by the milk-teeth is, on the whole, very equal.

Dr. F. C. Webb, the most accurate English observer on the range of dental variation in the various races of mankind, and who has adopted the arguments originally adduced by Professor Owen, thus eloquently, and we think fairly, develops the teleological argument against the operation of a derivative law of transmutation as observed in the tooth-characters of the higher apes: —

‘In the *Anthropoid* apes, in common with inferior members of the group, the purposes for which the teeth are designed differ from those which they fulfil in Man. In him, their primary use is the division and mastication of his varying aliment; and secondly, they subserve the faculty of speech. The unbroken series and equal length of the teeth, the thin crowns of the moderately-developed incisors, the smooth equality of their posterior surfaces, their vertical or nearly vertical implantation, are all provisions in which may be recognised a design in unison with the capacious and complicate brain, the exquisitely organised larynx, and the flexible and highly-endowed tongue. In human organisation, all is rendered subservient to the expression and embodiment of thought. In the Great Ape, the dental apparatus is constituted on a different plan, and answers a widely differing purpose. Endowed with no power to conceive or perfect instruments by which he may repel attack or assert superiority over the denizens of his native forest, Nature has furnished his jaws with organs of other mould than those which add enchantment to human smiles, and give distinctness to the accents of human eloquence. His teeth are destined not only for overcoming the resistance of the tough rind or harder shell which encloses the sapid fruit, but as deadly weapons they may claim equality with the fangs of the highest Carnivores.’ . . .

‘The order of succession of the permanent teeth presents this striking difference: In Man the canines and bicuspid come into place before the second molar, and the anterior part of the dental arch is completed long before the acquisition of the full grinding apparatus. In the great *Quadrumanes* the second molar is cut before the lateral incisors and premolars; and the large canine comes into place the last of the dental series after the third molar.’

Thus far we have dealt with Mr. Huxley's statements and arguments as mere questions of physical science, capable of being brought to the test of anatomical demonstration; but before we quit the subject we feel bound to advert to some considerations of a different order. Mr. Huxley's conclusion is (to quote his own words), that —

'If man is separated by no greater structural barrier from the brutes than they are from one another, then it seems to follow that if any process of physical causation can be discovered by which genera and families of ordinary animals have been produced, that process of causation is *amply sufficient to account for the origin of man*. In other words, if it could be shown that the Marmosets, for example, have arisen by gradual modification of the ordinary Platyrrhini, or that both Marmosets and Platyrrhini are modified ramifications of a primitive stock — then, *there would be no rational ground for doubting* that man might have originated, in the one case, by the gradual modification of a man-like ape; or, in the other case, as a ramification of the same primitive stock as those apes.' (P. 105.)

And he states in a note to a preceding passage, that —

'Believing with Cuvier that the possession of articulate speech is the grand distinctive character of Man (whether it be absolutely peculiar to him or not), I find it very easy to comprehend that some inconspicuous structural difference may have been the primary cause of the immeasurable and practically infinite divergencies of the Human from the Simian stirps.' (P. 103.)

These passages, and some others of a similar import, appear to us to exhibit in a striking manner the fallacy which pervades all Mr. Huxley's reasoning on this subject. It amounts in fact to a revival, under a more ingenious form, of the extravagant paradox of Helvetius and the French Encyclopédistes, who held that if the upper extremities of man had been terminated by a hoof instead of a hand, the human species would still be wandering in the forests, incapable of art, of habitations, and of defence. Are not these scientific sceptics in reality the most credulous of theorists?

Nobody disputes that there is the strongest analogy and resemblance between the structural organisation of the human body and the structural organisation of the higher mammalia. The senses and many of the organs of man are the same in kind, though not in degree, as those of the lower animals; and where there is a difference it is often in favour of the brute creation. The eye of the vulture, the scent of the hound, the limbs of the horse, are far more powerful than the corresponding human organs. But this dispute which agitates the comparative anatomists of the present day, and makes them alternately

offensive to each other and ridiculous to everybody else, has no practical bearing at all on the question of the proper origin and nature of mankind; for the real distinctive characteristics of man begin just where these resemblances of structural organisation leave off. This is the barrier which is absolutely insurmountable by the advocates of the theory of developement, because the differences between the animals and man are not differences of degree, but differences of kind. To Mr. Huxley, however, the question of structural organisation may well assume very great importance, for he gives us to understand that structural differences, however inconspicuous in their origin, may have been the primary cause of the divergencies between men and apes. We might comment on the extreme looseness and inaccuracy of his language even for his own purposes, since it is difficult to understand how a slight structural difference could be the 'primary cause' of anything at all, as it must itself have resulted from some other cause, and could in truth be no more than what the logicians call an accident. Mr. Huxley can scarcely mean to imply that the infinite divergencies between the human and the brute species may have originated in something as fortuitous and insignificant as a little rust on the pinion of a watch. Yet if he does entertain that opinion, it helps him not, for the rust on the pinion of a watch must have its cause also.

But our answer is of a broader character. We believe that all the higher faculties of human nature—all the powers that make us MAN—are visibly independent of that mere structural organisation in which, as we have seen, many of the animals surpass us. Take an animal gifted with the nicest sensuous faculties, and he will not approach in mental capacity the lowest of the human species. Take a man deprived or destitute of all his senses and animal powers, there is still something in his capacity immeasurably superior to the whole brute creation. There is the gift of articulate language,—the power of numbers,—the powers of generalisation,—the power of conceiving the relation of man to his Creator,—the power of foreseeing an immortal destiny,—the power of knowing good from evil, on eternal principles of justice and truth.

'What' (exclaimed Sydney Smith in the conclusion of his eighteenth Lecture on *Moral Philosophy*, in which he discusses the faculties of beasts with infinite wit and discernment), 'what have the shadow and mockery of faculties, given to beasts, to do with the immortality of the soul? Have beasts any general fear of annihilation? have they any love of posthumous fame? do their small degrees of faculties ever give them any feelings of this nature? are their

minds perpetually escaping into futurity? have they any knowledge of God? have they ever reached in their conceptions the slightest trace of a hereafter? can they form the notion of duty and accountability? is it any violation of any one of the moral attributes of the Deity to suppose that they go back to dust and that we do not? . . . I feel so sure that the blue ape without a tail will never rival us in poetry, painting, or music, that I see no reason whatever that justice may not be done to the few fragments of soul and tatters of understanding which they may really possess.'

To these questions structural organisation gives no answer at all. The theory of developement, thus applied, utterly fails to account for the phenomena it has to explain. Its resource would probably be to deny those phenomena; for it is impossible to give a solution of the intellectual and moral faculties of man by any comparison, however ingenious, between the structure of his body and that of the lower animals. Conscience and reason protest against it. Philosophy and science (not to speak of religion), alike condemn it. On the other hand, nothing prevents us from conceiving and believing in the absolute identity of man as a moral and intelligent being, under conditions of structural organisation totally dissimilar from those which are adapted to the physical conditions of our present life; and indeed the doctrine of the conscious immortality of the soul cannot be reconciled with any lower theory of our nature.

We have no desire to apply harsh names to the processes of scientific inquiry, still less to those who are engaged with sincerity in the prosecution of these inquiries; but we cannot conceal our suspicion that the theory propounded in this book is indistinguishable from that of absolute materialism, and even tends to atheism. It was remarked by the most calm and tolerant of modern philosophical writers, Dugald Stewart, who witnessed in his own day the prevalence of similar theories, that 'from those representations of human nature which tend to assimilate to each other the faculties of man and of the brutes, the transition to atheism is not very wide.'* Not being able to raise the brutes to man, they degrade man to the level of the brutes, to complete the symmetry of a scientific theorem; and having begun at the opinion of Lamarck, they end in the doctrines of the '*Système de la Nature*.' What other signification is to be given to the following passage?

'The whole analogy of natural operations furnishes so complete and crushing an argument *against the intervention of any but what are termed secondary causes in the production of all the phenomena of*

* Stewart's Dissertation. Collected Works, vol. i. p. 376.

the universe, that in view of the intimate relations between Man and the rest of the living world, and between the forces exerted by the latter and all other forces, I can see no excuse for doubting that they are co-ordinated terms of Nature's great progression from the formless to the formed—from the inorganic—from blind force to conscious intellect and will.' (P. 108.)

We confess our utter inability to affix to this sentence any meaning which we would willingly suppose it to convey. What are 'secondary causes?' They are in fact no causes at all, but merely the means by which a primary cause operates. Yet Mr. Huxley appears to exclude the intervention of any but secondary causes in the production of all the phenomena of the universe; and the concluding lines of the extract are of the same character. It is necessary that we should know to what this so-called 'Theory of Development' is leading us. If it means that all the phenomena of the universe are the result of 'Nature's' great progression from blind force to 'conscious intellect and will,' irrespective of that conscious intellect and will to which alone we ascribe creative power, that is purely and simply the scientific form of the doctrine which denies a Creator altogether, or places the Creative Mind at an incalculable distance from its works. Lord Bacon indeed said, more than two centuries ago, 'for certain it is that God worketh 'nothing in nature but by second causes;' and if this were Mr. Huxley's meaning, it were certainly no modern discovery at all. But, as we understand him, his meaning is precisely the reverse.

We agree with the lively Canon of St. Paul's, whom we have just quoted, 'that the weakest and most absurd arguments 'ever used against religion have been, the attempts to compare 'brutes with men:' but we have no intention of opposing Mr. Huxley's reasoning on theological grounds. Materialism and atheism, irrespective of all other considerations, are the least philosophical conclusions at which it is possible to arrive. They in reality explain nothing: on the contrary, they make the universe itself quite unintelligible. We are most reluctant to suppose that writers of this country and this age can deliberately intend to profess these opinions as the result of their scientific investigations. But it is to be regretted that Mr. Huxley in dealing with questions of so much gravity should have failed to convey his meaning with precision. The moment he quits those methods of physical science with which he is familiar, he appears to us to be out of his depth; and we can only suppose that he does not understand the full purport which might be ascribed to some of the expressions he has employed.

ART. X. — *History of the Greek Revolution.* By GEORGE FINLAY, LL.D. Two vols. London: 1861.

THE author of the history of Greece under foreign domination has brought to a worthy conclusion his task of many years. He has taken up the tale of the fortunes of his adopted country just where the ordinary scholar ceases to find interest in them. He has traced them through the whole period of Roman, Byzantine, and Turkish domination; through drear ages of decay or of torpor, varied by occasional intervals of struggling vitality; through ages unadorned by a single heroic name, or thought-inspiring event; through the longest era of entombment which as yet has in any European country preceded that of resurrection. An uninviting subject, assuredly, and one which Gibbon felt himself compelled to dispose of in a few sparkling chapters. But Mr. Finlay has nevertheless executed his task with singular honesty as well as knowledge, and produced a work which has merits independent of those of execution. It is unique, and therefore to the scholar indispensable. And now the two volumes before us, which serve as an appendix to the rest, evince a curious change both in the nature of his subject and the manner of dealing with it. We have no longer for our guide the historian of the past, but one who has witnessed and taken part in the scenes which he describes—the Philhellene of 1827, the comrade in arms of Gordon and Karaiscachi, the Attican landowner and politician, the victim of royal cupidity, and joint cause with Don Pacifico of Lord Palmerston's famous quarrel with Greece in 1850; the hermit of later days, who has dwelt in somewhat sarcastic seclusion under the northern shadow of the Acropolis, prophesying evil continually to the unjust king. His present work savours accordingly in every page of his personal experiences. The deeds of the revolution are recounted with all the animation of one who retraces in age the fortunes of that cause which fired his youth; subsequent events with the energy, and not without the prejudices, of a contemporary partisan. For although it is impossible not to be conscious of a radical and almost chivalrous honesty of purpose about Mr. Finlay, and though he will even go out of his way, on occasion, to render more than justice to enemies, yet the general effect of his last chapters is that of a laboured indictment against the Bavarian Government of Greece, and they must be read with due caution accordingly.

The events of the Greek Revolution itself have occupied

at different times a large share of these pages; and although Mr. Finlay has placed many portions of them in a new light, and enables the reader to form in some respects a clearer conception of that famous struggle than he could before, we cannot on the present occasion follow him through its details. Although a ruthless satirist of the public men, whether statesmen or generals, who were produced by the crisis, he does ample justice to those qualities of the people themselves which carried the country successfully through its trials:—

‘The conduct of the Greek population during the early period of the revolution,’ he says, ‘is worthy of admiration; it displays great perseverance and unflinching patriotism. In the wider sphere of political and military action, the influence of the people unfortunately ceased, and we see ignorance, presumption, and selfishness, in statesmen and generals, rendering the energy of the people nugatory. From some circumstance which hardly admits of explanation, and which we must therefore refer reverentially to the will of God; the Greek revolution produced no man of real greatness, no statesman of unblemished honour, no general of commanding talent. Fortunately, the people derived from the framework of their existing usages the means of continuing their desperate struggle for independence, in spite of the incapacity and dishonesty of the civil and military leaders who directed the central government.’ (Vol. i. p. 283.)

In truth, it is in that key-word, ‘perseverance,’ that we find the great practical spring of the Greek character; and it is on this element that those who may have to direct the future of Greece must chiefly calculate, and may safely rely. In dealing with Greeks, it is necessary to discard those conventional notions which we Northerners have imbibed about ‘souls made of fire, and children of the sun;’ and cease to fancy that rapidity of action and vehement will are the inseparable characteristics of Southern races. The very reverse seems to be nearer the truth — at least, in regard to politics. They generally are slow to move, stubborn in the pursuit of an object. ‘Chi dura vince’ is their motto. If, in political life, we may perhaps claim for our own race the union of strength of will with perseverance — for the French, strength of will with little perseverance — in the Greeks, and perhaps the Italians, strength of will seems comparatively low, perseverance high. ‘The Greek people,’ says About, in his ‘Grèce contemporaine,’ ‘may be said to have no inclination to any kind of excess, and to enjoy all kinds of pleasure with equal sobriety. They are a race without strong passion. They are capable of love and hatred; but neither their love nor their hatred are blind. They do good and ill on reflection, and reasoning is always mixed up with their most violent

'actions.' As far as politics are concerned, the clever though paradoxical Frenchman's observations have been confirmed by the events of the two last revolutions—of 1843 and 1862—each conducted with the most charming sobriety and politeness at the outset; but each, under the appearance of unanimity, covering the elements of disunion and anarchy; elements intensified in their disintegrating power by the national pertinacity.

We have spoken of these qualities as essential to the Greek character: a character deeply impressed on some three millions of men, of whom less than one-third live within the narrow bounds of modern Hellas, the remainder are scattered in a few agricultural communities in Thessaly and Epirus and Macedonia; in the cities of the Bosphorus and Asia Minor; and, in smaller numbers, throughout Europe. For the Greeks, like the Jews, are a people without a country. The Greek kingdom is small, poor, divided by an intestine anarchy which has hitherto proved ineradicable; the Greek people numerous, wealthy, and, from the very circumstances of their present political insignificance, devoting all that energetic perseverance which distinguishes them to the acquisition of commercial supremacy. This is a distinction which has been so often brought under public attention of late years that its repetition seems almost a truism; but it is necessary to place it fully before the reader, as no safe judgment can be formed respecting Greek political questions unless it is constantly borne in mind.

Three-fourths of the inhabitants of the kingdom are Greeks, as we have seen; a homogeneous race, boasting of descent from the ancient Hellenes, and probably with reason. On this point there seems now to be pretty general agreement. The opinion that the modern Greeks are by birth a Slavonic people, or altered by Slavonic conquest, is we may say gone out of vogue.* It is a more common notion that they form in truth a mixed or mongrel race, like De Foe's 'true-born Englishmen;' a notion urged with much humour and some argument in De Quincy's essay on Modern Greece. But this arises from a superficial examination of the subject. Greece in the course of

* Fallmerayer's theory was that the Hellenic population was exterminated by the Slavonic irruptions of the sixth and following centuries; and that the modern Greeks are descended from colonists collected by the Byzantine emperors among the people of the Bosphorus and Asia Minor, and sent in the tenth century to reoccupy the country. See this theory shortly stated, and shortly answered, in Brandis, '*Mittheilungen über Griechenland*,' and see also the first chapter of Mr. Finlay's '*Mediæval Greece and Trebizond*,' for a careful estimate of the Slavonic element in Greece.

ages has been repeatedly subjugated, sometimes overrun by foreigners. And no doubt these incomers mingled to some extent their blood with that of the old inhabitants. But when such mixture is in inferior proportion, and is not repeated, the effect of the importation wears out by ethnological laws; the half-breeds, produced in the first instance, intermarry again with the pure race, and the stream, tainted for awhile, runs clear again. 'It is an acknowledged fact' (says Sir C. Lyell, in his recent treatise on the Antiquity of Man), 'that the colour and features of the Negro or European are entirely lost in the fourth generation, provided that no fresh infusion of the one or the other takes place.' It is only where great part of the existing population is displaced, where 'fresh infusion' is frequently repeated, and above all where unions between the several races are also common, that a really mixed population like the English can spring up. Now, such unions between different races are in the East comparatively rare, and opposition of religions has even a stronger tendency to keep families unmixed than opposition of race. 'At present,' says Mr. Finlay, 'the Greeks are willing to intermarry with Valachians, Russians, and Albanians of the Eastern Church; but to render a marriage lawful with a Catholic of the purest Hellenic descent, it would be necessary to rebaptise the spouse.' (Vol. i. p. 8.) Mr. Finlay shows us in the first chapter of his book, and the carefully executed little map which accompanies it, that the Hellenic population is chiefly to be found in Greece Proper, in the north-western regions (formerly Acarnania and Ætolia), about Parnassus, in the northern and central portions, and extreme south, of the Morea, in Eubœa, and in the islands of the Archipelago. To these we must add, with a view to impending probabilities, the Ionian Islands; in which, indeed, the nobility are partly Venetian, the townsfolk a mixed race; but the peasantry probably exhibit as pure a Greek type as any extant. For the history of these islands has indeed records of many changes of masters, but none of any immigration of foreign occupants of the soil. And lastly, we must add Thessaly, a peculiarly Greek region in great part, left by an unfortunate error of the great Powers under the sovereignty of the Sultan, to whom it is of no value whatever. It is said that the last interest of the Turks in this province, their property in the soil, is fast disappearing, their estates being bought up by Christian purchasers.

Omitting a few thousand nomad 'Vlachs' or Wallachians, the remaining fourth of the population of modern Greece consists of Albanians, who have never fused with the Greek popu-

lation, but still occupy their districts or cantons apart; these are carefully marked in a map annexed to Mr. Finlay's work. Some believe these people to represent those perplexing Pelasgi who inhabited Greece before the Hellenic occupation of it. If this be correct, it is a singular caprice of Fate which has planted their pauper dwellings, inhabited by a hard-featured, light-haired race, more like Scotch Highlanders than Greeks, on that very slope below the Acropolis, which the ancient Athenians from tradition denominated the 'Pelasgicon.' 'Even in the streets of Athens,' says Mr. Finlay, 'though it has been for more than a quarter of a century the capital of a Greek kingdom, the Albanian language is still heard among the children playing in the streets, near the temple of Theseus and the arch of Hadrian.'

With this exception only, we have said that the inhabitants of Greece are still essentially, in the words of Lord Byron's friend the French Consul, 'the same canaille that they were in the days of Themistocles;' and it is this which still renders them so much an object of interest to the civilised world. All the deficiencies and political errors of the Greek race, 'brigandage' and anarchy, repudiation and dishonesty, are forgotten by the stranger nurtured in classical discipline, from the moment when he comes in sight of their sacred shore. From whatever side he may approach, as soon as his eye greets the tempest-furrowed point of Tænarus, or the columns of Sunium, or 'Leucadia's far-projecting rock of woe'—he feels like one who, after long wanderings through the world, has reached the home of his youth. The glorious sunlight in which the landscape is bathed, the unequalled purple of those waves, the enchanting outlines of those mountain horizons, all these things speak to him, not as other landscapes do, but as something of his own—something enjoyed in earlier and more enthusiastic days, and now restored to his embrace and filling up a void in his heart. This is the real Greece to which our imagination clings, and not the insignificant kingdom whose revolutions are just now perplexing the statesmen of countries which have, in truth, little interest, except sentimental, in its destiny. To this, however, our present thoughts must be directed, and we must leave the majestic visions of antiquity for far less attractive subjects of contemplation.

And it must be owned that the possession of all the unrivalled glories of classical antiquity is a very questionable dowry to modern Hellas. There is something oppressive, almost discouraging, to the dweller in such countries, in the constant, changeless presence of the memories of a greater time. We do not mean only the peasant who burrows in the walls of

some vast edifice of old which saves him half the trouble of constructing a house,

‘And, wondering man could want the larger pile,
Exults, and owns his cottage with a smile.’

He is but the type of a feeling widely spread, and extending to more educated and more thoughtful classes than his own. No one can have failed to notice the kind of apathetic depression which marks the dwellers in some old spectral Italian town, huddled together in its shrunken centre, surrounded by huge and for the most part unfinished edifices, the works of a generation young in hope and ambition, but which had not the means fully to carry out its own conceptions. Fortunately, perhaps, for the modern Greeks, they are not an imaginative race like the Italians, and of far livelier, as well as more vain-glorious, temperament. The presence of the ‘dead,’ but sceptered sovereigns’ awes them less, but it inflames their self-esteem far more. They might say with Schiller in his ‘Address to his Friends,’—

‘But with all its splendours, all its powers,
That high-favoured race has taken flight:
We, we live: the present day is ours,
And the living man is in the right.’

The rhapsodies of impulsive Philhellenes about their ancestors have had little effect on them, beyond that of puffing them up with a sense of their own enormous superiority to the nations of the West. Personally, the pleasure they take in the study or conservation of these ruins is next to none. President Capodistrias, a Greek to the backbone, could not hear Athens named without making a face: he once only spent a day there *incognito*, says Ross (a German engaged under King Otho in the superintendence of antiquities, whose entertaining ‘Erinnerungen’ have recently been published), and came back with the strongest contempt for the place and its remains, although he would assume an appropriate air of enthusiasm when conversing about them with a wealthy Milordos. Andreas Mustoxidi, the President’s trusty friend and official ‘Archæologos,’ never would go there at all; and wished ‘the devil might take the ‘Turks*, for not having demolished those antiquities, *avrà tà ‘áppaxia*, when they had the power.’ Your Greek companion on the Acropolis, especially if nourished at the ‘Otho University,’ will not fail to descant on the vandalism of Lord Elgin; but he

* We trust the venerable historiographer will forgive us for repeating a tale which we also find in Ross.

will regard with indifference the perishing heaps of exquisite sculptured fragments, piled together without arrangement, and exposed with scarcely any protection to the wanton mischief of native idlers and foreign midshipmen.* Yet, with all this, he would, no doubt, highly admire the classical patriotism of that young barrister who, two or three years ago, moved the 'Court of Arcopagus' for a rule to reverse the judgment pronounced† in the matter of Socrates; and would sympathise with the desperate efforts which are made to root out all convenient barbarisms from the language, and replace them by classical compounds: even as we have heard one of his class complain of the stupidity of the sailors of his country, who would persist in calling a steamboat a 'Vapor,' instead of using the bran-new university-minted name of 'Atmoploion.' These are trifles, but some of them serious trifles; as when the Bavarian professors, having satisfied themselves of the exact weight and value of an Athenian 'drachma,' proceeded to arrange the modern coinage on that footing; the drachma being worth just ninety centimes, or nine-tenths of a franc, and therefore quite incommensurable with that most convenient and widely-received of modern coins. So, again, in the choice of the site of towns, they professed to be guided by respect for antiquity rather than any sense of modern convenience. They transplanted the people of the mediæval Mistra to the site of the old Sparta; thereby achieving two purposes—the removal from a better to a worse locality, and the covering with modern buildings precisely that space which was most likely to repay the labour of excavation for antiquarian objects. But probably the greatest mistake of all, in this way, was committed in the choice of a capital. Nauplia had been that of Capodistrias: an unhealthy and inconvenient place. It was necessary to choose another; and many a noble site was under discussion: Corinth, the Piræus, even Megara, had their partisans, on commercial and

* Every one has heard the received account of the fall of one of the columns of the Olympeium at Athens, four or five years ago, viz. that it was 'blown down by the wind!' But we were told that the base was undermined by some careless workmen digging for earth: the winter's rain filled the hole and loosened the soil; a storm came, and down fell the column.

† This was seriously done as we have been informed: only rivalled, in joke, by that spirited Neapolitan impresario who advertised the other day that he was about to reopen the theatre at Pompeii with the *Figlia del Reggimento* 'after closing for eighteen centuries,' and prayed the public to extend to him the same favour which they had shown to 'his predecessor, Quintus Manius.'

other grounds of common sense. Pedantry, under the auspices of the whimsical King Ludwig of Bavaria, put in its claim for Athens, and won the day. Our friend Ross seems to take to himself some share of the credit. Greece obtained a metropolis five miles from the sea, without navigable and scarcely with drinkable waters, in an unhealthy climate, in the barrenest and most stationary province of the kingdom; inhabited up to and even within its walls by Albanians hardly speaking Greek. But the greatest offence of Athens is its geographical situation. The capital of Modern Greece should not look towards the perishing East, but towards the thriving West, the source of commerce, and light, and political life. These remarks are made in no idle spirit of criticism. The truth is, that the absence of a healthy public opinion, which has stifled the 'Greek constitution,' is partly owing to the mistake then committed. Corinth, or Vostitza, were their sanitary condition somewhat improved—perhaps Patrae, when the Ionian Islands are annexed to the kingdom—one of these should be the metropolis: if the expense of the change were not now too great.

Mr. Finlay proceeds from the wars of the Revolution to narrate the events of the short Presidency of Capodistrias; and this is one of the most important parts of his work, as the writer had peculiar opportunities of accurate knowledge. There was much of good and much of evil in his strongly-marked character and energetic government; but, whatever his errors and shortcomings, he died a martyr for his country. He endeavoured, and successfully, to break the power of those savage Maynote chiefs, who still prolonged, under independence, the ancient anarchy which they had fostered under the Turks, and which was only excusable as a wild protest against Ottoman dominion. We cannot but feel that it is a very prejudiced view which induces Mr. Finlay to represent him as actuated merely by personal spite against the family of Mavromichalis. They were not merely the representatives, but the chief living perpetuators, of the old uncivilised system. And when he fell by the daggers of the brother and son of that 'anarch old' Petro Bey, whom he held imprisoned as a measure of security, the people of Greece, more just than their modern historian, honoured their president with true sorrow, and executed wild retribution on his murderer.*

* It is rather a proof of the absence of vindictiveness which has often characterised Greek political enmities, that this Petro Bey lived unmolested for many years afterwards in Athens, and that his family have retained much of their influence. His son

The death of Capodistrias, and failure of his feeble brother Augustin to carry on the Government, plunged Greece into mere anarchy. 'This little country,' says a French writer, 'had worn out in twelve years five congresses, two constitutions, and I know not how many executive bodies.' The crown had been offered to King Leopold, as all the world knows, and by him refused: it is not so generally known that it had been also declined by the liberal British prince of the day, the Duke of Sussex: and that it was only on his refusal that negotiations with Prince Leopold commenced. In 1832, Greece was reduced to a state of almost complete anarchy by internal

held office under the late 'Provisional Government' constituted on the expulsion of Otho. Still, the ancestral polity of the Maynotes will soon be as much a thing of the past as that of the Scotch Highlanders; which may be our excuse for inserting here a legend of the Mavromichali family, belonging to the Byronic era of Greece.

About 1780 Captain Petro, then head of the family (father of the Petro, afterwards styled Bey), was obliged to give up his second son, George, as an hostage for the good behaviour of his clan, to the Capitan Pasha. Two years afterwards he received intelligence from Stamboul that the child was dead. But a rumour reached the family that he still lived, and had been adopted into a Turkish household. Petro the second, afterwards called 'Bey,' entered deeply into the schemes of the Hetærists. He went to Venice in 1796 to engage Napoleon in their support, and was sent by the French leader to the Ionian Islands to concert measures. But the treaty of Campo Formio put an end to these intrigues. Petro was forced to conceal himself for a time, to avoid the vengeance of the partisans of England. But he returned to Mayna, and succeeded to the position and influence of his father. In 1815 a Turkish admiral, Shukur-Bey, was sent by the then Capitan Pasha to concert with Petro some steps to be taken against the pirates of the Morea. The admiral visited personally the old tower of the Maynote chief. There, according to the custom of the country, everything was contrived with a view to defence. The family lived on the first story, to which the only access was by a network of stairs and winding passages, intended to give its occupants some security against an enemy who might have obtained possession of the ground-floor. To the surprise of his conductors, the admiral appeared to find his way through this labyrinth as readily as themselves. Then the thought flashed across the mind of the aged mother, who still lived, that this was her long-lost son. He passed hours in her company, inquiring and conversing with affectionate solicitude respecting all the members of the family. But the dark caution of the race and time prevailed; the son (if he it was) would not divulge his secret, nor did the mother dare question him: he left them a stranger, as he had come; but the Mavromichalis continue to boast of having furnished Turkey with an admiral, and the Turks nicknamed Shukur the 'Maynote Pasha.'

dissension. The Three Protecting Powers signed on the 7th of May in that year the definitive treaty, under which the young Prince Otho of Bavaria was designated to fill the throne. How little the anticipations with which he was welcomed were justified by the result, is now matter of history. We have no wish to attempt any paradoxical refutation of the conclusion to which thirty years of miscalled reign have led most impartial observers. The recently expelled monarch was neither fitted by natural character, nor by education, nor by the influence which a more powerful but not much more comprehensive mind, that of his Queen, had obtained over his own, to achieve the difficult enterprise of reigning over the Greeks at all, or the all but impossible enterprise of reigning over them under the forms of a constitution. But, having said thus much, we must protest against that ignoble vehemence with which political writers in general, and we are sorry to say most of all in England, have allowed themselves to exult over the fallen monarch, before they had studied either the causes of quarrel between him and his subjects, or the prospect which those subjects really enjoy of bettering their condition by his expulsion. He who throws indiscriminately the blame of recent transactions on the King, Queen, and Court, or contents himself with the hollow phrases which conventional liberalism applies on all occasions of dispute between monarch and subject, is guilty at once of injustice towards the vanquished, and of sycophancy, in the old and worst sense of the word, towards the Greek people; calumniating their supposed enemies, instead of pointing out the austere truth, that to their own corruptions and factions, and want of self-restraint, the utter failure of constitutional government to establish itself in Greece is really attributable. Mr. Finlay's habitual tone of hostility towards the Court we can willingly excuse—he has grown old in opposition, vexing a righteous but not very practical soul with the misdeeds of the Court close at his doors; he had, moreover, with it one of those personal quarrels of long standing which pervert the views even of the most honest. Others, who now profess to guide the public mind in England, are using more violent language than he with far less of discrimination. 'It has been clearly brought to light,' says Mr. Strickland, in his recent pamphlet, 'by the Financial Commission recently assembled in Greece, that peculation has been reduced to a system; that a corrupt and venal financial administration was fostered by King Otho; that Greece was being ruined by Greeks, at the dictation of Otho.' As Mr. Strickland was himself the subordinate who assisted Sir Thomas Wyse on that

commission, such a declaration will have its weight with many. We can only set against it the counter-statement of a French authority*, who appears to have had exactly the same sources of information as Mr. Strickland. After reviewing in detail, with much apparent impartiality, the shortcomings in the administration of Greece which that commission detected, he proceeds:—

‘To whom then must we in justice attribute the responsibility for these social failures, these administrative weaknesses? To that sovereign who has now pursued for thirty years, with patient circumspection and a slowness often judicious, the accomplishment of that under-taking full of perils which the choice of the Three Powers imposed on him? Not in our opinion. Neither does the guilt belong to this or that personage, to this or that party: it is the very circumstances of the case which were mainly in fault. . . . Greece, having become a nest of discontents and rivalries, has never been able to afford nourishment to all the impatient ambitions which jostled with each other in its narrow limits, abandoning the profitable labours of agriculture or industry for the seditious aims of political life. The country is poor, ill-lodged, ill-clothed, and nevertheless, it has all the presumptuous fancies of wealthy communities. The Greek people passes its time in discussing the affairs of government instead of thinking about its own, and does not perceive that its fields are uncultivated, that it lives in cabins, that its industry is as yet unborn, and that its public spirit allows itself to be guided by dangerous instincts into very devious paths.’

But instead of comparing authorities, let us strive to learn a little for ourselves from the teaching of facts.

From the arrival of Otho in 1832 to November 1843, the Government of Greece was, in the ordinary sense, absolute. The young King reigned, at first, through Bavarian advisers, by the help of Bavarian bayonets, and of the residue, after various greedy hands had fingered it, of the sixty million francs of outfit, which the house of Rothschild afforded him with the guarantee of the Three Powers. Afterwards, in Mr. Finlay’s words, he ‘became his own prime minister.’

In November 1843, this irresponsible Government was upset by Kalergis, the military, and the people of Athens, through the calmest of revolutions, which only cost the life of a single gendarme. A constitution was inaugurated; and constitutional

* ‘Revue des Deux Mondes,’ for June 1862, p. 335. This writer who uses the signature of René de Courcy, says that he served under the French Minister in Greece, M. de Monthéron, and had under his eyes the papers of the Financial Commission. His essay, ‘La Grèce depuis l’Avènement du Roi Othon,’ is both able and dispassionate.

or party government, with two Chambers and responsible Ministers, has since prevailed in Greece until the expulsion of the King at the end of last year. History, therefore, gives us eleven years of absolute, and nineteen years of constitutional rule. Now, even those who are the most determined to see the hand of the Court in every mischief, the most resolved to shut their eyes to the unpleasant truth, that since 1843 the Government of Greece, with all its faults, has been mainly self-government, will scarcely deny this much—that King Otho must be held more directly responsible for its conduct in the first, than in the second period. Let us then compare their results.

Even Mr. Finlay, in whom honesty often rises superior to partisanship, cannot refuse this tribute of hard-wrung praise to the Bavarian masters of Greece:—

‘The early period of the Regency,’ he says (vol. ii. p. 337.), ‘was marked by the introduction of a system of administration which put an end, as if by enchantment, to the most frightful anarchy that ever desolated any Christian country in modern times. Many wise laws were enacted, and some useful measures were carried into execution promptly and thoroughly. The errors committed were probably fewer, and the good results produced much greater, than could have been obtained by any government composed solely of Greeks.’

In examining more closely what the absolute Government, hampered as it was, actually performed, we find the following results. The Courts of Justice were early remodelled, and established on French principles, on a footing which has hitherto proved satisfactory to the country. The municipal, or more properly communal, organisation of the country, was, as some say, created, as others say, restored after a period of anarchy, by laws of which we shall have more to say presently. The administration of army, navy, finance, was organised out of nothing. Education was much attended to, and not on paper only. ‘The Seminary for Schoolmasters’ was started in 1835: 225 schools were established by 1839: gymnasia, Hellenic schools, Polytechnic schools, followed. The University of Athens dates from 1836. The ‘National Bank,’ now the *bête noire* of Greek ultra-patriotism, was created in 1841. Of the attention of the absolute government to those local means of transport and communication which are unfortunately far more essential to Greece than universities or even banks, but little, alas, can be said; but it laid out, at all events, a fair scheme of public road-making; paved Greece with many good intentions, and with one or two tolerable roads.

Now, when we set against this account that of useful

measures passed, or works executed, under the Constitution, we find that the latter amounts almost literally to nothing at all. We may have overlooked some such measures from want of information; but we have, for our own part, been unable to detect any legislative or executive result of the public labours of the last twenty years, except a few insignificant and timid improvements in the wretched system of taxation. The era of absolutism was one of incomplete beginnings; that of the Constitution seems to have completed nothing begun, and attempted nothing new.

But the benefits of constitutional government, it is said, are to be sought less on the surface of statute-books than in the indirect stimulus which it gives to wealth and improvement; partly through the security afforded to industry; still more through the incitement which it ministers to social energy. And this is true. In countries in which freedom is based on the immovable foundation of a true public spirit, its introduction operates as if by enchantment, and statistical tables usually show at once the signs of prosperity and progress — signs which can scarcely be understood, or appreciated, except by those who have learnt by political study to see their real cause. But then the freedom must be substantial. The mere name of a constitution will do nothing, except deceive those whose prejudices prepare them for such deception. Let us compare the chief numerical tests of the two systems in Greece. At the accession of Otho her population was probably only 700,000; in 1843, about 900,000; in 1862, 1,100,000. In 1833, the customs reached two million drachmas or francs; in 1840, three millions; in 1860, about four millions. Direct taxes, in 1833, 4,650,000 drachmas; in 1840, 10,400,000; in 1860, about the same. In other words, the prosperity of the country, as estimated by these tests, increased considerably more in the first period of ten years than in the second period of twenty. Now we are quite willing to make all necessary allowance for the greater rapidity of reaction during the time immediately following such disasters as those of the revolution; still, it is impossible for anyone, with these figures before him, fairly to contend that the period of absolute government in Greece was one of depression or decay, and that freedom, so called, has developed its natural resources.

Constitutional government, in short, has been a failure in Greece. Thus far all seem agreed; but then the Greeks in general, and the modern Philhellenes, set the failure down, without hesitation, to the King and the Court. We believe this to be an error, and, for reasons already stated, a very in-

jurious one. Let us disregard mere fine-sounding phrases, and examine what the meaning of the term, constitutional government, really is. It means, in every-day practice, government by parties. Knots of men, more or less closely connected by common political views, get power and place in turn, and hold it as long as they can persuade the Legislature, elected by the community, to put confidence in them. In ordinary times, when there is nothing afloat which particularly excites patriotic spirit, such a government has a tendency to degenerate rapidly into a mere struggle of factious self-seekers. It is preserved from this decline solely by the existence of two elements, found only in highly educated communities; self-restraint, whereby the politician almost unconsciously controls his steps, and checks his own propensity to self-aggrandisement; public opinion, which imposes on him those duties where self-restraint fails to do so, and exacts from him, as the price of popular support, a devotion to the popular welfare. Where these exist, constitutional government is among the highest achievements as yet attained by social science. Where they do not exist, it is at best a very indifferent form of polity, under which humanity rather shuffles imperfectly onwards, than advances with firm and safe steps.

Now in Greece there has been absolutely no political education; and, consequently, to speak of political self-restraint as an actual or possible characteristic of the Greek statesmen of our day, would be merely ludicrous. And public opinion scarcely exists at all. Where could it be found? A higher, or a middle, class scarcely exists. It would be idle to expect it among the poor peasantry who constitute three-fourths of the population, and whose social virtues, genuine as they are, do not extend beyond the circle of the family or clan; or among the 40,000 able sailors, the largest proportional number which any European country can show—men with thoughts little bent on politics. The towns might furnish a class better calculated for the creation of such an opinion; for the Greek townsman has a shrewdness which, under favourable circumstances, might raise him to the rank of his republican ancestors; but then there are scarcely any towns, properly so called. Athens is the mere recent creation of the Court; Hermopolis (Syra) of the steamboats. Neither has as yet an established civic population; and there is not another place, at least on the continent, of sufficient importance to have its influence felt beyond the nearest partition-wall of mountain.

The indirect influences which control constitutional government fail therefore entirely. Nor is there any element of direct

conservative influence. There is scarcely any upper class—no materials for a House of Lords, or a Senate. There are a few wealthy merchants, but these keep aloof from politics; and not a hundred families, says 'About, in the whole country, possessed of independent fortune. Mr. Senior, in his published volume of 'Conversations,' amusing at once and most instructive, gives us the following remarks of an 'intelligent Greek: '—

'Our great misfortune is one which we have inherited from Turkey—the absence of an aristocracy. The officers or captains of the *Armatoles*, whom we have called *Palikari*, the bishops and the primates, were the native aristocracy of Greece when the revolutionary war broke out. They were few, they were little superior in knowledge or cultivation to the rest of their countrymen, and they had not the prestige of birth. . . . King Otho found us without a real aristocracy, and we have not acquired one. We are essentially democratic: the clause in the constitution, which forbids conferring hereditary honours, was carried by acclamation. The consequence, I fear, is that we are unfit for constitutional monarchy. There are no persons in the country who have made politics a study, or indeed who could afford to do so.'

The Senate consequently consists of members nominated by the Crown, whose qualification is to have filled certain considerable offices for certain periods; and they receive while sitting, 17*l.* 10*s.* a month. It need scarcely be added, that the great majority are the servile tools of each ministry; the minority, bitter politicians who have lost their places, and are under the influence of what has been described as the most dreadful of human sensations—that which arises from seeing our neighbour's jobs always succeed, while our own always fail.

But real power resides in the Chamber of Deputies, elected triennially by very extended suffrage. This is the body which the Ministry has to cajole when in existence, and to constitute, through elections, when in embryo. Management of elections has been, therefore, the very keystone of the system. This is chiefly effected through the judicious use of one or two levers, of which the most remarkable is the local or 'municipal' organisation of the country.

It has been the common resource of those who are determined to attribute the refusal of the Greek constitution to 'march' to any and every cause but the political deficiencies of the Greek character itself, to maintain that Greece possessed under Turkish rule an excellent system of local self-government, which the Bavarian Court had not the sense to preserve. In the very able 'Memoir' which Mr. Finlay communicated, signed with his name, to the 'Daily News' of last January the

6th, we read as follows touching the ancient 'municipal organisation' of Greece:—

'One of the greatest evils caused by the long duration of King Otho's reign has been the extinction of the parochial and communal institutions which existed under the Turks. The Ottoman Government allowed the people to exercise a considerable degree of control over the fiscal business of their locality; and by doing so afforded to the rural population a sphere of action for personal benevolence and public spirit—two things which King Otho's administration has almost entirely extirpated. The communal and parochial organisation of Greece under the Ottoman Government are well known. Even the parish then exercised a practical influence on rural society.'

Now we can only answer Mr. Finlay by Mr. Finlay—the journalist by the historian—for no one knows so much of the matter as himself, on whichever side he may be pleased to write. This is the manner in which he speaks in his 'History' of this same 'communal organisation':—

'The municipal institutions of the Greeks have been much vaunted. In reality they amounted to little more than arrangements for facilitating the collection of the tenth of the produce of the soil by the agency of the Greeks themselves, in order to prevent the extermination of the agricultural population. . . . Oriental fiscality was the essence of the municipal institutions of the modern Greeks. Each district was assessed to pay a certain amount of taxes, and the repartition of a part of the sum to be paid by the Christians was left to the clergy and the primates. In some places the persons intrusted with this power were named by the Porte: in others they were elected by the people. The authority thus created was greater in the rural districts than in the towns. And in those parts of Greece in which there were few resident Turks, a popular election gave the institution a national character. But this municipal system was too intimately connected with bad principles of taxation to become a means of training a nation to freedom and justice. Like everything in the Ottoman Empire, it was full of anomalies. Some communities had the privilege of maintaining armed guards or Christian troops, called "Armatoli;" some enjoyed their freedom under the guarantee of written charters from the sultans; some enjoyed great local privileges; and some were relieved entirely from the land-tax. . . . Municipal liberty can have no vitality unless the local magistrates are directly elected by the people, and responsible to the law alone. . . . The slight hold which the municipal institutions of the modern Greeks had acquired in the affections of the people is demonstrated by the ease with which they were perverted by Capodistrias, and changed for a new system by the Bavarian Regency.' (Vol. i. p. 16. 18.) 'It may be truly said (he adds elsewhere) that this vaunted institution never protected the liberties of the people except by accident.' (Vol. ii. p. 284.)

We cannot, therefore, attribute much reality or life to the com-

municipal system of Greece under Turkish rule. Scarcely enough of it existed to form even the basis of a new organisation by the Bavarian Government. Let us now see what that Government actually did on the subject. The country was organised, after Gallic fashion, under *Préfets*, *Sous-Préfets*, and *Maires*,—in Greek *Nomarchs*, *Eparchs*, *Demarchs*. The commune, 'Demos,' was constituted on a fairly liberal basis; the officers being elected by household suffrage, except the *Demarch*; for whose office three candidates were chosen by a highly qualified 'college' of electors, and out of these three one selected by the king. The provisions which gave the administrative authorities an oligarchical character may be injudicious in a country where the feeling of equality so strongly prevails; but they are liberal indeed compared with those under which the shadows of municipal institutions existing in most European countries are organised. But the truth is, that it is not the system itself, nor the Government which instituted it, but those who are called upon by the law to work it, who are in fault. The body thus constituted has the administration of the communal property. There is, in fact, no Government audit or superintendence. Anyone acquainted with the nature of municipal consciences must be perfectly aware to what this must lead, in the absence of a powerful press and public opinion. The funds of the demarchies, to use Mr. Finlay's words, 'are diverted from purposes 'of local and public utility;' and, according to Mr. Strickland, the amount of those funds which has been sunk under this wasteful system may be estimated at 60 million 'drachmas,' or more than two millions sterling.

Of course it is the interest of those who might be called on, but are not, to account for these dilapidations, to make common cause with the powerful of the day,—the Ministers and the Court. Thus the *Demarchs* play into the hands of the *Nomarchs* and *Eparchs*, who return the compliment; and the whole local administration is organised into an electioneering machine, when the occasion arises.

'Every Greek,' to use the words of one of Mr. Senior's interlocutors, 'is an accountant to the Crown, and every Greek is in debt to the Crown. Every Greek wishes for a place: every Greek wishes for a bit of the vast tracts of national land. Every Greek is at law with some other Greek. The electors of the demos are told who are the persons whom the king wishes to see elected. If his wishes be thwarted, woe to the local electors. They are called on for their arrears, they get no places, they get no public land, they get no justice from the tribunals, they are outlaws. . . . The consequence is that the demarch, who is in fact master of the demos, who collects

and disposes of its revenues, and manages all its concerns, and particularly its elections, is a creature of the king's.'

Next to the municipalities, the readiest machine in the hands of the Government for controlling the elections, at least in the agricultural districts, appears to be the land-tax. The following is a brief account of this primitive impost: for more detailed information we refer the reader to Mr. Finlay and Mr. Strickland. It consists of, 1. One-tenth of the annual produce (*tithe*, *ἐγγειον*) from all occupiers of land. 2. Quit rent to the State from occupiers of public lands, varying from 10 to 20 per cent. in addition to the tithe. But inasmuch as the State owns, according to some, nearly half the surface of the country (chiefly land left either waste or without owners, in consequence of the events of the revolution), it may be assumed that 25 per cent. is the amount of the ordinary outgoings of the Greek cultivator in the shape of rent and direct taxes — no very enormous exaction in itself; but it is levied in kind, on grain and much other produce. This tithe, or tithe *plus* quit rent, is either farmed (sold, that is, by anticipation, at a price fixed by public competition); in which case the purchaser collects it; or it is simply collected by the agents of government. The system is, of course, open to all the objections urged on economical grounds against tithe in England, which it is unnecessary to recapitulate. But it is liable to other special objections, arising out of the difficult nature of the country and absence of roads. Lest the State should be defrauded, every operation of the farmer must be conducted under the regulation and inspection of the collector. He fixes the time for harvest, threshing, carrying to market. The grain of his district must be sent to his threshing-floor from an area of ten miles round, in order that he may without trouble separate his portion. His means of transport, chiefly horses and mules, are certain to be the most numerous and available. Accordingly, he becomes very often (as we have been informed) an agent for the peasants, for the purpose of conveying and selling their produce; and acquires over them the double power arising from his office and from his superior means.

It is needless to expatiate on the mischief of such a system: but Mr. Finlay (himself a landowner) sees no remedy for it but total abolition; Mr. Strickland, none but the imposition of a poll-tax! Now the land-tax and rent together make up more than a third of the revenue of the country. Instead of abolishing it, the obvious course would seem to be to commute it for a money payment, as was done among ourselves with tithe. A land-tax, equitably adjusted, is among the most ordinary

and reasonable sources of revenue in most European as well as Asiatic countries. And the Government of Greece has honestly endeavoured to effect this change, and has succeeded to some small extent. But we have been informed by one very conversant with the internal economy of the country, that every attempt at such commutation for tithe has hitherto met with opposition from the peasantry themselves. The peasants' argument is simple enough. At present, they say, we are indebted to the tax-collector or farmer (in his public capacity) only until he has taken the crop off our ground. We are never in arrear with him, because he shares with us on the spot. But if we were bound to pay him an annual sum of money, we certainly should be in everlasting arrear. The least mismanagement in our affairs, the most passing inclemency of the seasons, would create a debt; usury, and our want of capital, would do the rest; after a brief struggle, we should simply be 'sold up' and exterminated from the soil, to become either emigrants or brigands, — the only choice to an expropriated Greek peasant.

It is obvious that the establishment of roads, among the other enormous benefits which it would confer on the country, would go far towards emancipating the peasant from the dominion of the farmer of taxes, by the simple operation of bringing him into closer connexion with markets. And few countries afford such facilities for road-making. Scarcely any part of Greece is fifty miles from the sea, and the shore everywhere abounds in small country harbours, which a few miles of road would bring into connexion with the agricultural districts. Material is almost everywhere abundant. And yet, as we know, scarcely anything has as yet been accomplished. Loads are carried along tracks instead of roads, on the backs of animals, men, or women*, instead of carts. A law was passed a few years ago, compelling the peasant to devote a certain number of days to road-making; but nothing has been done under it: it would require a stronger executive than that of Greece to enforce such a 'çorvée' as this. The simpler plan of encouragement, by which the British Government has covered the Ionian Islands with a network of excellent roads, seems never to have been

* Mr. Lear, in his 'Journals of a Landscape Painter in Albania,' relates how he was shocked by meeting a number of Epirote women toiling up a mountain with their enormous burdens. 'The fact is,' said his guide, utterly mistaking the cause of his disapproval, 'there is no remedy, for mules there are none here, and women are next best to mules. Vi assicuro, Signore, though certainly far inferior to mules, they are really better than asses, or even horses.'

tried. It is thus described by Sir John Young in a despatch to Lord Stanley in May 1858:—

‘It is quite surprising the amount of work I got done in this way by small grants in aid. The villagers were willing to give, and actually gave, some thousands of days of gratuitous labour, in order to complete branch roads from the main lines to their villages, and enable carts to pass; for they know that a man with a cart and horse, where there is a practicable communication, can support a family, while a man with a horse, obliged to use panniers only, can scarcely pay his expenses. It is a gratifying fact that the number of carts on the island of Corfu has well nigh doubled in the last four or five years.’

Of course the tax-collector or tax-farmer, being the most important person in a rural district, and directly in connexion with Government, is made use of to manage the elections, and, together with the Nomarch and the Demarch, is said to move the machinery of the ballot-box. With an Elective Chamber constituted by elections thus managed, it is obvious that the Greek ministries which succeeded each other under the Constitution had little to fear from responsibility to the legislature, or inspection of accounts, or discussions on budgets and estimates. The Constitution contains the familiar provisions of all similar instruments respecting these matters. The way in which they have been ‘worked’ is thus described by the French reviewer whom we have cited. After expatiating on the abuses of the absolute period, he adds:—

‘After the memorable events of 1844, this state of things ought to have been sensibly ameliorated, since it was one of the chief alleged grievances which had occasioned the revolutionary regeneration. Ministerial responsibility, the voting supply bills, the introduction of budgets, the audit of accounts, in one word, the legislative control of the Chambers over taxation and expenditure, would, it was asserted, inevitably render perfect the management of the resources of the State. Nevertheless, it turned out that this salutary control, the most sacred privilege of constitutional assemblies, had in strictness never been exercised, and that general indifference had waived its exercise. Out of a dozen budgets, only two or three had been placed before the eyes of the legislative body before they were put in operation, and several had never been published until the last days of the financial year to which they related. The accounts had in general been never laid before the Chambers nor demanded by them; and it may be fairly supposed that they never would have been presented by the Ministry at all, if the Finance Commission had not insisted on it.’

We have entered at perhaps unnecessary length into the causes which have rendered constitutional government in Greece

a mere delusion; and must express our own opinion that they do in truth lie deep in the national character itself. It is of little importance how nicely what remains of blame is to be apportioned between the successive ministers, the Kalergis, Kolettis, and Mavrocordatos, and their needy followers, on the one hand, and the Court on the other. Each-power, no doubt, alternately used and was used by the other as an instrument. Probably the ordinary division of the spoils in ill-organised constitutional states took place also here. The Ministers got the common rewards of party warfare; the Court got its personal objects, its expensive and insubordinate standing army with 8,000 men, 1,000 officers, and seventy generals, its little household jobs and extravagances; the King his ugly palace (originally built, however, with his own money); the poor Queen her pretty gardens, the only substitute in that arid soil for the groves of Cynosarges and Lyceum; for which the citizens of Athens were ungallant enough to grudge her Majesty the use of the 'sleepless fountains' of Cephissus. Those who attribute to King Otho personally any greater share than this in the general maladministration of his kingdom, have to reconcile as best they may their reiterated assertions respecting his narrowness of mind, his vanity, his 'slowness of apprehension, poverty of invention,' indecision, and incapacity, with their equally positive declarations that he has in truth governed as absolutely under the name of his ministers, for the last twenty years, as he did before; that he 'had a better right than Napoleon to say "l'état, c'est moi," and had contrived to make his constitutional kingdom the most perfect example which Europe contains of a 'centralised despotism,' according to sentiments reported in Mr. Senior's journals.

Even the most unpopular of governments, however, if it is able to bide its time, has sooner or later its chance of public favour; and this arrived for King Otho and his supporters, when the Russian war of 1854 once more aroused the sleepless hope, which abides in every Greek bosom, the so-termed 'great idea' of establishing his nation and his faith on the ruins of the Ottoman Empire. The causes which have directed all the ambition and energy of the people towards this remoter object, instead of the less exciting purpose of developing the resources of the little Hellenic kingdom, are too well known to need recapitulation here. But perhaps justice is hardly done to the urgency and intensity of the motives which impel the Greeks to obtain the first instalment of their destined greatness,—the acquisition of Thessaly and part of Epirus; where, as we have said, the slow ebb of Turkish dominion has nearly left the land dry

for new occupants. Anyone who may read Miss Bremer's animated account of her visit to Mount Pelion, that green and fertile ridge on which forty thousand industrious Greeks seem encamped on Turkish soil, almost independent of Turkish Government, and within sight of the Hellenic frontier, will see at once how strong are the ties of mutual affinity which draw together the populations of the two sides of that ill-chosen line. It is idle, therefore, although it was fashionable in the days of our Turkomania, to speak of the Greek incursion into Turkish territory in 1854 as a mere exploit of brigands, under the disguise of political agitators. It was, in truth, a national effort. And the Count was partly carried away by circumstances, partly led by real sympathy with the national enthusiasm. But the King was forced by the superiority in arms of the Allied Powers to retrace his steps. He did so, to all appearance, honestly, though reluctantly; and, for a time, the nation seemed to appreciate the sacrifice made by the sovereign. The ministry of Bulgaria laboured, not unsuccessfully, to effect a reconciliation between Greece and the Allies. France and England abandoned, in 1856, their temporary military occupation. But, as if to give some colour of utility to that occupation, it was resolved that a commission, appointed by the Three Powers, should examine into the financial resources of the kingdom, and especially into its ability to meet its pecuniary engagements. This commission was composed of the ministers of the Three Powers, with men adapted for the task (Mr. Strickland, as we have seen, was one) to assist them. It commenced its sittings in February 1857, and finished them in May 1859, with the distressing recommendation that Greece should reserve annually for her creditors 900,000 francs, 'that sum to be increased progressively, at periods which will be determined upon when the mode of payment and of appropriation of sums paid towards the extinction of the debt shall be settled.' From the moment when this resolution was made known to the Greek people, and followed up by actual payment for one year, it may be said that the doom of the Bavarian dynasty was sealed.

In order to make plain the importance of this unhappy business of the Debt, in the present emergency of Greek affairs, we have extracted, with some abridgment, the summary given in the article of the '*Revue des Deux Mondes*,' to which we have so often referred:—

'The bankers of London lent the Government of Greece in 1823, 800,000*l.*, in 1825, 2,000,000*l.*; but on conditions so burdensome that only 920,000*l.* reached the national treasury. In 1832, Greece

obtained 2,400,000*l.* from the Three Powers (or rather from the house of Rothschild under the guarantee of the Three Powers). Afterwards it obtained under the title of "advances" 200,000*l.* from Bavaria; and Bavaria, having received nothing since 1845, is now her creditor for a sum far exceeding the advances . . . Finally (and this is the main point on which the attention of the commissioners was fixed), the information now obtained enables us to state that on March 1st, 1870, the annual sacrifices made by the Three Powers will have completely reimbursed the house of Rothschild in capital and interest, but that at this epoch Greece will owe France 40,000,000 francs; England about the same; Russia 42,000,000; in all more than 121,000,000 francs (or nearly 5,000,000*l.* English), a sum truly enormous in comparison of her finances!

The entire debt of Greece at present is estimated by Mr. Strickland at about seven millions sterling, independently of the unpaid interest of the two revolutionary loans of 1823 and 1825, which, if capitalised, would amount to 175 per cent. on the principal. This has to be met out of a revenue barely reaching 800,000*l.* per annum, in a country where material civilisation is far in arrear. The Greek may well deem the problem insoluble, and seek to escape by foreign adventure or propaganda from the dreary narrowness of his own political horizon. But he has, in addition, the constant presence of the irritating feeling that this very debt, on account of which his race are stigmatised as repudiators throughout Europe, was contracted with scarcely any benefit to his unfortunate country. We have seen that out of the three millions raised in the revolutionary time, only 900,000*l.* reached the treasury. The annals of stock-jobbing, of Philhellenic rapacity in England, and Klephitic rapacity in Greece, account for the remainder. But the case of the sixty million francs guaranteed by the Three Powers is harder still. Twelve million were stopped at once for sums alleged by Russia to be due from Greece to Turkey; which being paid, Russia discovered that Turkey owed her a considerable sum also; the accounts were squared in Greek money, and the result of the whole transaction was, unless we are misinformed, that one of the three guaranteeing Powers reimbursed herself in hard cash to about one-half of the extent of her guarantee. In the next place, a large sum was impounded to pay interest by anticipation. The residue furnished King Otho's outfit, set his court going, and paid his Bavarian soldiers for some years; affording at last, we believe, some five or six millions of francs, as a net result, towards the necessities of the kingdom itself!

Now, in the eye of international as well as municipal law, a debt is a debt, nor can the judge who has to enforce the payment

look to its origin, when the existing creditor is himself innocent of fraud. But for all this, public opinion will necessarily regard with a very different feeling the default of him who refuses to pay an honest tradesman's bill, and him who repudiates the claim of an usurer for which he has received no value. It is impossible, on any ground of fairness, not to give the Greek the benefit of this distinction, whatever it may be worth. And severer moralists may be satisfied by seeing how repudiation has in this case brought its own punishment. The debt has been a millstone round the neck of the struggling kingdom to this hour. Whenever her internal condition showed the slightest improvement — whenever the turmoil of factions ceased for a moment, — the wail of the bondholders was instantly heard through the calm; a hungry cry, which it was equally impossible to silence or to satisfy, until it really, became the natural object of patriotism to drown that melancholy strain in the sounds of civil discord once more. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that when the nation found that the ultimate result of the events of 1854 was at once to adjourn indefinitely the prospect of expansion abroad, and to enforce a most unwelcome exaction at home, the cup of its bitterness was full, and a dynasty which had no hold whatever on public affection became the natural victim.*

In May 1861, an extensive plot for its overthrow was discovered and suppressed, with the necessary leniency of a Government conscious of its want of support. In September of the same year, during the absence of the King in Germany, the young fanatic of seventeen, Aristides Dosios, attempted the life of the Queen. There was nothing in the circumstances of the crime itself to distinguish it from the multitude of similar actions, the offspring of morbid vanity and distorted public sentiment, which have thrown in later times some discredit on modern civilisation. But the manner in which it was received

* The resource for the liquidation of the debt which might most naturally present itself would be a mortgage of the very extensive public lands. But they seem to have been hitherto the ordinary fund for jobs and extravagances. Everybody has been 'recompensed' out of these lands; and those most especially who had most thoroughly frightened the Government. 'Dotations' of land have been conferred not only on powerful individuals, but on 'the Phalangists, the Cretans, the Neophytes, the Fire-ship men, the Mariners;' whoever these several genera of patriots may be; and not only has the land been thus wasted, but from the absence of maps and registers it is said to be impossible to ascertain the limits of what remains to the public.

by the nation was ominous of evil. Dosios was connected with some of the best Fanariote families, and nephew to Alexander Mavrocordato himself. His father was a respected official under Government, his mother a literary lady of some celebrity. Society seemed at once to take him under its protection, as a misguided but interesting young patriot. He was indulged in his prison with a splendid supper, in company of those who were arrested on suspicion of concern in the plot; his health was drunk with enthusiasm, his photograph sent to Paris for distribution; tortoise-shell rings, engraved with his initials, were for a time the fashion among the exquisites of Athens. He was tried, and sentenced to death, rather in the way of a judicial drama, for his greater glorification, than with any serious intention of punishing him; the sentence commuted to hard labour for life: and when last we heard of him (a few months ago) he was dining habitually at the most fashionable Athenian *table-d'hôte*.

The King yielded to circumstances, and called, in the beginning of 1862, on the veteran hero of the revolution, Admiral Constantine Kanaris, to form a Government, or rather to constitute himself the figure-head of a Government to be framed from the ranks of the Opposition. The 'programme' which his intended colleagues placed in the mouth of the old Albanian sailor is worth a moment's attention, because it really shows that the national movement was based on a vague though hearty detestation of the Bavarian dynasty, and not on any specific charges which could be embodied in a categorical declaration of grievances. There are the usual commonplaces which always do duty on such occasions: 'real responsibility,' we are told, 'ought to be found where official responsibility resides: the public opinion of a nation living under Constitutional Government can always recognise where real responsibility is placed.' There is the usual protest against interference with elections, but no instances specified; the usual denunciation of a 'camarilla'; certain officers, therefore, ought to be discharged from court service, and others, more acceptable to the nation, substituted for them: 'ôte-toi de là, que je m'y mette;' and the whole winds up with a demand for a national guard and a law of the press, and a denunciation of the 'Bank of Greece.' It is surely due to the reputation of an unpopular but unfortunate monarch to record the fact that at the moment when his enemies were most anxious to make out a good case against him, this was all which could be found for insertion in the indictment.

Kanaris, however, could not or would not form an adminis-

tration acceptable to the Crown, and the unpopular 'Ministry Miaulis' remained in power. Then followed, in rapid succession, the revolt of Nauplia, suppressed (February 1862), but with much additional cost of dignity and power to the Government; and the general uprising of October last, by which the dynasty was summarily banished from the country. That uprising was at once military and popular in its origin. The insurrection commenced at Vonitza, in Acarnania, on October the 16th. Patras revolted on the 21st, Athens on the 24th, and then and there, in the words of Mr. Scarlett's despatch, 'suddenly put an end to the reign of King Otho.' Bulgaris, then an Opposition senator, headed the new Provisional Government. The King and Queen were absent in the Morea; fortunately, as our Minister adds, they did not arrive at the Piræus until the revolution was completely successful. As it was, very little bloodshed or disturbance accompanied the event. The King was utterly unprepared for the approaching catastrophe; he had been 'received with enthusiasm,' as he assured Mr. Scarlett, at every place which he had visited in the Morea. But there was no mistaking the signs of the times; every officer except the captain of his steamship, the 'Amalia,' deserted him at once, and he had to take refuge on board H.M.S. 'Scylla.' From the road of Salamis he addressed his last farewell, not without dignity, to the nation which he had governed with so little of glory or comfort. 'I have resolved,' he says, 'for the present to quit a land which I have loved, and which I cordially love, and for whose welfare I have, during nearly thirty years, painfully and earnestly laboured.'

Of the Provisional Government which the nation next established, little need be said. It consisted of three members — Bulgaris, Admiral Kanaris, and Rufos. They deserved, at all events, credit for the calm and at the same time dignified attitude which their little country has assumed towards Europe, and for their steady repression, thus far, of untimely aspirations towards 'the Great Idea.' But it would be idle to speak as yet of any signs of internal stability, or of any concord beyond that noisy and feverish unanimity of the moment which is always the first product of an unopposed revolution. And since we commenced these pages, this ephemeral Government has been dissolved; the Assembly, like the Convention of old, has taken on itself the task of conducting affairs by committees; and the latest intelligence is of dark reactionary plots to bring the Bavarian back.

The first aspiration of the community was for a new foreign king. No other experiment in the way of government seems

to have met with even a fraction of favour in Hellenic eyes. Nor is it difficult to understand the reasons for this political movement, though the singular eagerness and perseverance with which it has been prosecuted may excite some surprise. Greece, most unfortunately for herself, has been the object of the solicitude, and shuttlecock for the political game, of the Three Powers, ever since the first hour of her so-called independent existence. Her statesmen in succession have been better known as the partisans of England, France, or Russia, than as representing any definite shades of opinion on the internal affairs of the country. And were these traditional ties loosed, there would remain the guaranteed debt, with its arrears of interest, which, in truth, makes Greece a bondsman to her three illustrious creditors. On one or the other of the three Greece must lean by preference. But the object of this preference has been of late years singularly changed.

The causes are easily understood which for so long a period gave Russia a marked preponderance in the affections of the Greek nation. To the common ties of religion, and of the 'great idea' of triumph over the Ottoman, was added the influence of that extraordinary prestige of Muscovite dominion which the late Emperor had spent his life in creating. The Crimean war changed all this at once and effectually. When the French and English squadrons occupied the Piræus, it needed not the political acuteness of the Greek race to perceive and feel that the supremacy of the Czar was gone from him, at least for a generation to come, and given over to the Powers of the West. And as there had always been mingled with the love of Russia a considerable amount of terror as Greek civilisation, and Greek love of liberty, did in reality shrink instinctively from the approach of Muscovite autocracy, even while invited—it followed that as soon as circumstances made it evident that Russia could not establish a Greek empire on the Bosphorus, the day of Russian influence was passed. Nothing can be more marked than the absolute indifference which has been shown, on the part of the nation, in the last crisis, to the views and policy of that empire of which it seemed a few years ago likely to become a dependency.

Of the three nations which have taken in hand the regeneration of Greece, France is perhaps the one to which Greece owes the most; or, to speak more strictly, from which Greece has received the most of good and the least of evil. The first occupation of the Morea, in 1828, by her soldiers, was a happy period for that desolated region. Mr. Finlay's pages do ample justice to the energetic devotion with which they applied them-

selves to ameliorate the physical condition of the land. And it is not without some feeling of inferiority that we quote his remark on the subject. 'The activity of the French troops exhibited how an army raised by conscription ought to be employed in time of peace, in order to prevent the labour of the men from being lost to their country.' Their short occupation of the Piræus, in 1856, was signalised by similar efforts to do all the good which their position enabled them to effect among the inert natives.

The French soldiery, in short, as Mr. Finlay elsewhere expresses it, laboured most industriously, without fee or reward, for the benefit of a country with which they had only an accidental connexion. And as the French governments have practically done more than others towards the development of their petted and wilful pupil, so French writers and statesmen have in general judged her more reasonably, and with more of political foresight and genuine liberality than we have. Any one who wishes to form an opinion respecting the present state of Greece had much better consult French than English authorities: for Frenchmen seem more at liberty than Englishmen to speak of things as they are, and less hampered by the necessity of suiting a particular class of public opinion by venting the platitudes of ordinary liberalism, and abuse of German tyrants. But notwithstanding all this, it remains true that France possesses less influence in Greece than either of her rivals, and must probably have far less share in moulding her future destiny. The cause is a very simple one -- religious antipathy. The influence of France is identified in Greek minds with that of the Roman Catholic priesthood; and the mixture of fear and aversion with which this is regarded is powerful to a degree to which even we, nourished as we are among mutual hostilities of the same kind, should find it difficult to realise. The Eastern Church is of necessity on the defensive: it has no proselytising tendencies: it remains strong in its grand old stereotyped form of early piety, strong in the devotion of millions of worshippers; but its clergy are utterly unlearned in the tactics, ignorant even of the subjects, of modern controversy. They consequently only dread the more their able and aggressive Western antagonists. For this reason, no Roman Catholic king can probably succeed in Greece. Any such sovereign must needs wish to be on good terms with the priesthood of his own persuasion; and to be on good terms with them is to be on bad terms with the nation. They are regarded, and with truth, as nourishing the undying 'great idea' of subjugating the Eastern Church. And it cannot but be observed how much France has

lost from that tendency to pursue at the same time opposite or inconsistent objects, which has been of late so characteristic of her foreign policy in more regions than one. In the Eastern world she has long assumed the position of protectress of the Latin churches; a position which may be worth more to her than her influence in Greece, but is quite incompatible with the latter. The Greeks are familiar with the part played by France in the controversies of the Holy Sepulchre; with the manner in which Lebanon, with its Maronite population, has been turned into an outlying fortress for French and Romanist supremacy; with the strange and as yet unexplained intrigues which seemed for a time likely to bring over in a body the Bulgarian clergy and laity to the Western faith; and towards the agents in these proceedings, secular and clerical alike, they nourish the permanent hostility founded on constant fear. They know that no concordats or engagements, no promises of moderation, bind religious opponents:—

ὥς οὐκ ἔστι λένουσι καὶ ἀνέωσαν ὅρκια πάντα,
ἀλλὰ καὶ φρονέουσι διαγίγρεαι ἀλλήλοισιν.

‘If the European Powers endeavour to force on us any other king than Prince Alfred,’ (says a recent Athenian pamphleteer, Koulouriotes, in evident dread of the alternative which we have fore-shadowed,) ‘we would choose a republican form of government; and, if that should not be possible, we should prefer to bow down once more under the sway and domination of our old Turkish masters, as our ancestors did four hundred years ago, when they were required by the Pope of Rome to change their religion if they expected any help from him. . . . Better the return of Turkish domination than the shameful acceptance of another nominee of the Three Powers, or any other ruler than him whom the Greek people have selected.’

And we certainly believe that this is not all bravado; and that in these days, when a generation has arisen which knows little of Turkish dominion except its tolerance, there is many a pious Greek who would rather live under the Sultan than under a Romish monarch who makes the sign of the cross the wrong way, and celebrates Easter Sunday, as he phrases it, ten days before our Lord was crucified.

The causes which act in the negative, at the present conjuncture, against Russian and French influence, act of course in favour of British. The Greeks owe us a grudge on divers accounts, as having urged alleged national rights against them far beyond reason and justice, in the matter of Pacifico and his fellow-claimants; as having been the most pertinacious of all in repressing the propagandism of their ‘great idea.’ But their quarrels with us are all above board; they

have no suspicious fears of our preparing for them either political or religious subjugation. And, we may add in full justice to ourselves, they believe in our fair-dealing, our fundamental good intentions towards them, our love of political freedom, and, above all, in our power. The mistress of the sea must, on any emergency, be mistress of Greece. That the hope of obtaining the cession of the Ionian Islands had much to do with the cry for Prince Alfred, we do not believe. The measure may be substantially in accordance with the political wishes of the Greek nation; if put to the vote, it would probably be unanimously adopted both in Greece and in the islands; yet it seems true, nevertheless, that the influential Greek demagogues care little about it, while the ordinary class of politicians rather fear it. Indeed, we were told a year ago by a good judge of Greek public opinion, that in Athens the feeling was against it, from a kind of conviction that the annexation would bring with it more new place-hunters than new places, and that the insular mother-wit, improved by English education, would give candidates for power from that quarter a dangerous advantage. The commercial tie between England and Greece has more to do with it. There has been of late years a marked increase of population and of thriving in certain portions of Greece; and these are particularly connected with the English trade. A report recently made by the able British Consul at Patras, Mr. Ongley, shows an amount of progress within the last few years in the Morea very strongly contrasted with the despondent pictures which Mr. Finlay and others draw of the internal state of the country, in their eagerness for accumulating charges against the Bavarian dynasty; strongly contrasted, we must add, with the symptoms of lifelessness and decay which show themselves in provinces nearer to the seat of Government. It is to the valleys of Arcadia, Elis, and Messenia, above all to the wealthy maritime plain of Achaia, that the traveller must repair who wishes to gaze on signs of regeneration rather than on memorials of former greatness. There are some who, in their despair of amelioration, have believed that Nature herself in these later days has conspired with political evils to perpetuate the ruin of Greece—that her sun burns instead of fertilising, her clouds have ceased to drop their beneficent showers on summits rendered bald by the destruction of the forests, that her torrents cover year by year her productive land with larger masses of débris, or extend the borders of the mephitic marshes; that the harsh, stunted, grey vegetation of Africa is slowly extending its dominion over the soil, and expelling the freshness of the old deciduous woods which connected her with the

European continent. But in the parts to which we have referred Nature, nourished by human industry, shows no signs of decay. She is ever beneficent as of yore, and only withholds her gifts from those who will not earn or deserve them. But then the region in question is vivified, as we have said, by English trade; and in particular by one singular branch of it. Ever since the reduction and equalisation of our duty on currants, that eccentric race of vegetables, consumed only by Britons, produced only on the shores and islands adjoining the Gulf of Corinth—Corfu, they say, is too far north for it, Cerigo too far south—has formed a link between the two nations, hardly less strong, to compare small things with great, than cotton created of old between England and America. Currants form in ordinary years about a third of the entire exports of the country. Advancing prosperity is therefore especially perceptible at Patras, Vostitza, and other points which the English trade has reached or is about to reach. We would not overrate the strength of mere commercial sympathies in politics, as compared with those of race and religion; but they have their value notwithstanding in shaping and maintaining alliances, and there is no fear that any disappointment which the refusal of Prince Alfred may occasion, will permanently shake the good feeling which at present subsists between the two nations, unless other political differences, now adjourned or obscured, rise again into the ascendant.

That refusal was unavoidable; but it has thrown back the affairs of Greece into a state of lowering uncertainty, from which it is difficult not to draw the worst auguries. Probably there are only a very few ultra-politicians, in Greece or out of it, who would not in their hearts admit that, for some time to come, an enlightened despot would be her best governor—a despot who should crush her factions with the strong hand, direct her policy aright by energy of will, and at the same time have sense enough not to interfere in details, wherever local self-government could accomplish the object required. But such a despot were hard to find, nor, when found, could he be imposed on Greece, in the present state of the world, by other Powers. The Greeks must deal with matters as protocols abroad and constitutions at home have made them. And, therefore, the subsequent refusal of the Duke of Coburg to accede to the proposal of the Three Powers is, in our view, matter of great regret. If the dynastic principle is to be maintained at all—if the future ruler of Greece must be a constitutional Prince, selected from the reigning families of Europe—and no alternative seems as yet to have suggested itself either

to Greek or foreign politicians — no one could unite so many advantages for the purpose as this distinguished Prince. We do not speak of his family and alliances, though these would have offered guarantees of stability not to be overlooked; but of himself. The throne of Greece requires, emphatically, a man to sit on it; one to whom years have given reflection, without diminishing as yet his strength of body or mind; one accustomed to political life, and familiar with the ways and sentiments of other orders beside his own; one accustomed, moreover, to traveller's habits and hunter's fare, who could make himself at home in the simple circles of mountaineers and seamen; one with a will strong enough to guide her, and powers of mind to think for her, and yet tact enough to mark out for himself, in all minor matters, the line between the king who governs and him who reigns. All these faculties Duke Ernest would have brought with him. And the very eccentricities of his political temperament, which have made his position difficult to hold in the confused area of German politics, originating as they do in independent and enlightened thought, would have done more service in the exceptional condition of Greece than the mere routine character of an ordinary Serene Highness. He has made his choice, however, on grounds of which none can gain-ay the validity; and that to the sincere delight of the loyal old-fashioned population among whom his lot is cast, and whom he refuses to abandon. Rumour now informs us that a new candidate is likely to be proposed for the acceptance of the Greek nation, in the person of Prince William of Denmark, brother of our newly welcomed Princess of Wales. The star of his family is so much in the ascendant, that a courtier might be forgiven for presaging good fortune from the announcement. For our own part, we will only say, that failing a sovereign of adequate ability, and armed with constitutional powers sufficient to enable him to rule in earnest, we are disposed to believe that the experiment of a Republic might be a safer one in Greece than in countries more advanced in the ordinary sense. It may be true that the Greeks are fictitious, self-seeking, suspicious, low in public morality — serious deficiencies, doubtless, for political life — but they are what nations long fettered by paternal governments cannot be; full of resource and intelligence. They are in truth 'Republicans of yesterday.' Their government under the Turks was barbarous enough, but it amounted to a kind of fortuitous democracy, controlled by the occasional interference of an absolute master. The Bavarians, with really good intentions, cultivated that most un-Oriental principle which, for want of a better name,

we term bureaucracy. Thus the nation was never fairly driven to the exercise of those internal energies which we hold it to possess. Absolute self-government is an heroic remedy, which has a chance of success in so desperate a case as this, where the milder treatment of partial or apparent self-government has failed. A Republic, with a strong local, but not federal, organisation, and a President chosen for a long period, and with extensive powers — if a foreigner, like the Podestà of a mediæval Italian commonwealth, so much the better, — this is an alternative which we should regard with reasonable hope. What we most deprecate is a renewed experiment, by the Three Powers, of the 'never ending, still beginning' system of foreign tutelage.

Under such a complication of difficulties as now besets the Greek question, it is no wonder that the irresistible desire of the people of the Ionian Islands for annexation to Greece — irresistible, if they were to be judged of by public manifestations and by the doings of their elected chamber — seems to have subsided into a very quiet and manageable lukewarmness. Now that the protecting Government has expressed its willingness to grant in a regular way what they demanded with so much violence, the leaders of the movement seem as much disappointed as Sheridan's heroine in the 'Rivals,' when she discovered that 'there was to be no elopement after all.' Still, we believe that the Ionians would be misjudged by those who should hastily conclude that the annexation movement arose out of mere temporary fanaticism in the people, or mere factious purposes in the leaders. It may be true enough that it originated with the active minority; with that 'mezzo ceto' in which modern revolutions are usually fomented; and that it has been fostered by the disappointed adherents of the older 'reactionary' system, overthrown by Lord Seaton's reforms in 1850: by no means an unique instance of a combination of Tories and Radicals. The more properly Conservative classes, gentry and peasantry, may have been silent, through inertness, and partly from terror. But for all this, the classes in question, though they may have a negative dislike to change, have no active sympathies except in accordance with that minority. The gentry of the islands are, it is true, half Italian in origin, and not without Italian traits in character. The 'libro d'oro' of Corfu, the roll of its little provincial nobility, was framed on that of Venice, and comprises many a Venetian name. The inscribed arcades of the University of Padua are covered with records and armorial bearings of Ionian students, brought there by the policy of Venice to study along with the scions of her own jealous

aristocracy. And yet it is true also that the very descendants of the chivalry of St. Mark have become in the course of generations thoroughly Orientalised. Many of them even now speak but imperfectly the Greek language, and yet have adopted to fanaticism Greek politics and Greek religion. The veteran Cavalier Dandolo, for many a year the leader of the Corfiote Philhellenes, boasts of descent from the famous Doge, and yet is the author of an energetic essay against the spiritual authority of the Pope. On the other hand, the peasantry are, as we have already said, a very unmixed, and a very simple-minded and honest, race of Greeks. Neither class bear us any attachment: neither would oppose any substantial resistance to the popular movement, were it resumed. We are, therefore, firmly of opinion that our Government took the wisest as well as justest course in seizing the first reasonable opportunity which offered itself for relieving the Ionians and ourselves alike from the burden of an unprofitable and unpopular Protectorate. No doubt the details of the step taken afford, unavoidably, scope for hostile criticism. It may be argued, that where England cannot act without the consent of other Powers, that consent should have been obtained before the step was announced; to which we believe that the true answer is, that the only way to avoid diplomatic difficulties was to declare our own will first, and then endeavour to acquire the necessary foreign adhesion to our proposal. It has been suggested also that there was something ungracious, and scarcely politic, in so wording our announcement as to make it appear as if the islands were to be thrown in as a prize for a successful revolution, directed against a monarch with whom we at least had no cause of quarrel, and the main cause of whose unpopularity was his enforced adherence to our Turkish policy. And the difficulties in the way of the execution of the project are many and serious. If it is to wait, according to the letter of the announcement by our Government, for the establishment of a settled monarchy in Greece, its prospect of ripeness seems somewhat distant. Nor are we to suppose that an island so tempting from its natural advantages as Corfu, so little connected geographically with the kingdom of Greece, so admirably placed to be a thorn in the side of the perishing Turkish monarchy, will be suffered to pass under Greek domination without many a scheme among European politicians to turn it to some other use. Nor do certain very obvious elements of the question seem to have been thought of with a view to adjustment. The islands have a trifling debt of their own: Greece an overwhelming one. Are they to be made

partakers in the normal state of bankruptcy which is the lot of the latter? Again, we are not aware whether any thought has as yet been taken for those thousands of Ionians, scattered over the Levant, who now thrive under the shield of British consular protection; a protection which many of them are said grossly to abuse, but which it will be difficult to withdraw without occasioning very serious loss and danger to the innocent as well as the guilty. Perhaps, it will be found that the protection must be continued to those individuals who are now in actual enjoyment of it. These are questions, all of them 'thorny,' some of them serious. But we have little doubt that a line of conduct which is at once righteous and expedient will succeed in spite of them; and that it will be generally acknowledged that the best mode of ensuring that success was by presenting our policy rough-hewn at first, and leaving to wisdom and fortune the task of shaping it.

In other respects the future of Greece seems wrapt in darkness. The 'great idea' must go again to sleep for awhile, as it has been forced to do so many times since first it was awakened near a century ago by the Russian cannon in the Bay of Tchesmé. Greece has before her the ungrateful task of reorganising herself, before she can dream of extending her frontier over Epirus and Thessaly, and still more before she can realise her grander Byzantine vision. And nothing can be more obvious than that her true interest lies in delay. If we can imagine the long threatened disruption of the Turkish Empire taking place at once, it is all but certain that the Greek race is not yet in a condition to profit by it. Were the Christian population of European Turkey unanimous and homogeneous, it would form a magnificent fraction of mankind. A people which should unite the romantic bravery of the Servians and Montenegrins with the Chinese-like industry of the Bulgarians, the subtle intellect and mercantile energy of the Greeks, might be fitted to occupy and hold against all comers the noblest of European dominions. But the prospect of such union, at no time very hopeful, seems remote; and we can hardly anticipate that a people, which finds it so difficult to fill the vacant throne of Athens, is already in a condition to restore a Christian Emperor to the throne of Byzantium.

INDEX

A

Alcock, Sir Rutherford, his Capital of the Tycoon, reviewed, 517.

B

Bédarride, M. J., his *Juifs en France*, &c., reviewed, 180.

Bergenroth, G. A., his Calendar of Letters, Despatches, and State Papers, preserved in the Archives of Simancas, reviewed, 378.

Bible, the, and the Church, 498 — question of 'Inspiration,' 499 — 'Various Readings,' 505 — contradictions, 506 — scientific accuracy, 507 — literary character, 508 — free inquiry, 513 — historical criticism, 515.

Birks, Rev. T. R., his *Bible and Modern Thought*, reviewed, 498.

Black Country, the, 406 — colliery and iron-work, 411 — legal regulations, 413 — explosions, 415 — ventilation, 418 — Hartley, 419 — education, 423 — labour in the Midland district, 425 — 'charter-master' system, 426 — Mining Colleges, 427 — qualities of miners, 429 — wages, 431 — pit-girls, 436 — colliers' cottages, 437 — pastoral supervision, 439 — observance of Sunday, 440.

Burton, Rev. J. W., his *Inspiration and Interpretation*, reviewed, 498.

C

Canning, Lord. See *India*.

Catalogue du Musée d'Anvers, reviewed, 116.

Chéris, Col., his *Histoire de la Campagne de 1815*, reviewed, 147.

Clay, Rev. W. L., his *Prison Chaplain*, reviewed, 241.

Colenso, Bishop, his *Pentateuch and Book of Joshua*, noticed, 498.

Convict System in England and Ireland, 241 — transportation, 244 — 'Probation' system, 248 — 'mark' system, 248 — Penal servitude, 249 — convict department in Ireland, 249 — Lusk, 252 — tickets-of-leave, 256 — failure of our convict system, 260 — garotters and burglars, 265 — Royal Commission, 267.

Crimea, Invasion of, 307 — alliance of France and England, 308 — Protectorate of the Holy Places, 315 — misconceptions of the Czar, 318 — military resources of the Turks, 320 — Mr. Kinglake's attack on Louis Napoleon, 321 — restoration of the empire, 323 — 'compact of midsummer, 1853,' 324 — Lord Clarendon and Lord Stratford, 327 — declaration of war, 328 — Sinope, 330 — course of Austria, 332 — Lord Palmerston, 333 — military combinations, 336 — Duke of Newcastle and Lord Raglan, 337 — Russian plan of operations, 338 — Silistria, 339 — invasion of the Crimea, 341 — Sebastopol, 343 — personal conduct of Lord Raglan, 347 — Alma, 349 — combat on Telegraph Hill, 351.

Curtis, B. R., his *Executive Power*, reviewed, 269.

D

Dalhousie, Lord. See *India*.

Darnell, N., his Translation of Döllinger's *Gentile and Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ*, reviewed, 180.

Döllinger, Professor John. See *Judaism, Modern*.

F

Female Life in Prison, reviewed, 241.

Finlay, Dr. G., his *History of the Greek Revolution*, reviewed, 570.

G

Gachet, M. Emile, *Lettres inédites de P. P. Ruyens*, reviewed, 116.

Gentz, *Frederic von*, *Diaries of*, 42—his services to the cause of European independence, 43—Varnhagen von Ense's biographical sketch, 46—Gentz's literary career, 49—Hauterive, 51—visits Weimar, 52—abandons Prussia and joins Austria, 53—visits England, 55—Tracts in 1805, 56—'Balance of Power,' 57—execution of Palm, 59—King of Prussia's 'Letter to Napoleon,' and Lombard's 'War Manifesto,' 60—Madame de Staël, 63—Count Stadion, 65—Metternich, 66—papers on finance, 67—Congress of Vienna in 1814, 68—Carlsbad Congress, 70—letters to Adam Müller, 71—Rahel, 72—Fanny Elster, 75.

Goldfields and Goldminers, 82—California and Australia, 85—British Columbia, 88—Silurian rocks, 90—Coast Range of Australia, 90—'aqueous' and 'igneous' theories, 96—Mr. Woods' Geology of Australia, 97—Dividing Range of Victoria, 99—quartz-mining and deep alluvial mining, 105—Ballarat, 105—'deep sinking,' 107—Frontage System, 108—Bendigo, 111—quartz-mining, 112—Mr. Belt's statements, 115.

Gratiolet, M., his *Mémoire sur les Plis Cérébraux de l'Homme et des Primates*, reviewed, 544.

Greek Revolution, the, 570—character of the Greeks, 571—races, 572—Albanians, 573—respect for antiquity, 575—Presidency of Capodistrias, 577—treaty of the Three Protecting Powers, 579—King Otho, 579—Dr. Finlay's hostility, 579—Government of Greece, 579—results of absolute and constitutional government, 581—'municipal' and 'communal' organisation, 584—land-tax, 587—Otho's share in mal-administration, 590—'great idea' of the Greeks, 590—debt of Greece, 591—plot of 1861, 593—revolution of 1862, 595—Russia, 596—France, 596—religious antipathy, 597—causes of British influence, 598—choice of a King, 600—Ionian Islands, 602—future of Greece, 604.

H

Homer's Odyssey, 353—merits of Mr. Worsley's translation, 352—Dean Alford's version, 355—burial of Achilles, 358—colloquy of Odysseus with the shade of Anticleia, 358—Calypso and Odysseus, 359.

Hooper, G., his *Waterloo, the Downfall of Napoleon I.*, reviewed, 147.

Hugo's, Victor, Les Misérables, 208—social wrongs, 211—characters in the work, 213—Bishop Myriel, 213—toleration, 216—Jean Valjean, 218—liberated convicts, 224—Petit-Gervais, 225—Fantine, 227—Javert, 231—great blenish of the book, 235—Marius and Cosette, 238—death of Valjean, 239.
Huxley, T. H., his *Man's Place in Nature*, reviewed, 541.

I

India under Lord Dalhousie, 1—his 'Policy' of Annexation, 2—the Punjab, 3—Oude, 7—Col. Outram's report, 11—working of the Anglo-Indian Government, 12—Sir H. Lawrence, 12—Col. Sleeman, 13—Pegua, 16—Nagpore, 17—Sattarah and Jhansi, 17—Sir George Clerk's doctrine, 18—Lord Dalhousie's general principle, 19—public works, 20—Pitt and Fox, 23—political position of the Company, 25—changes effected in 1854, 27—mutiny of Vellore, 29—Sir Charles Napier and Lord Dalhousie, 30—Lord Dalhousie's changes in the army, 32—relative strength of European and native armies, 36—commercial policy, 38—native education, 38—Lord Dalhousie's 'policy,' 41.

India under Lord Canning, 444—Government of Oude, 444—Oude Sepoys, 447—Oude, 448—Dum-Dum, 450—General Hearsey, 451—Barrackpore, 451—Berhampore, 453—first act in the Great Indian Mutiny, 454—mutinous spirit in Oude, 457—Lord Canning and Sir H. Lawrence, 457—mutiny at Meerut, 459—Lord Canning's character and conduct, 461—political agencies, 464—Sir John Lawrence's Letter, 466—Native Contingents, 468—fiction of the 'Double Government,' 469—Lord Derby's Proclamation, 471—Land Settlement in Oude, 473—Lord Ellenborough's celebrated despatch, 474—Talookdar Settlement, 476—inheritance by adoption, 479—Native States, 480—Indian army, 483—Local Government of India, 483—European troops, 486—Indian finance, 491—land-tax, 494.

Japan, 517—Sir R. Alcock's work, 519—political constitution of Japan, 520—Japanese civilisation, 520—constitution, 525—the treaties and their results, 527—murder of the Gotajiro, 530—Daimios and their revenues, 531—relations with Japan, 534—trade, 535—policy of Russia, 536—true policy of England, 539.

Judaism, Modern, 180—the Talmud, 182—Jewish restoration of learning, 185—Maimonides, 186—Jewish thought in Spain, 188—the Reformation, 189—Spinoza, 190—Moses Mendelssohn, 191—Jewish emancipation, 192—Reformed Synagogue, 195—German Jews, 196—French Judaism, 197—M. Salvador's works, 198—characteristics of Protestantism, 203—rise and origin of the Christian faith, 205.

K

Kalisch, M.M., his *Commentary on the Old Testament*, reviewed, 180.

Katharine of Arragon, her marriages, 393.

Kinglake, A. W., his *Invasion of the Crimea*, reviewed, 307.

L

Lawrence, Sir H. M., his *Essays*, reviewed, 1.

M

McCaul, Dr., his *Testimonies to the Divine Authority and Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures*, and his *Examination of Bishop Colenso's Difficulties*, reviewed, 498.

Man's Place in Nature, 541 — manlike apes, 542 — geographical distribution of the anthropoid apes, 543 — fossil forms, 544 — abnormal variations in the physical structure of man, 545 — 'mastoid' processes, 546 — Professor Huxley's doctrine, 546 — Darwinism, 547 — real difference between Man and the apes, 548 — gorilla, 551 — 'atavism,' 551 — modifications of the cerebrum in the *Quadrumana*, 552 — *Archæcephala*, 558 — counter-statements of Owen and Huxley, 559 — 'hippocampus minor,' 561 — Dr. Knox, 563 — structural differences between men and apes, 564 — Dr. Webb, 565 — structural organisation, 565 — tendency of the 'Theory of Development,' 568.

Misérables, les, reviewed, 208. See Hugo.

O

Observations on the Treatment of Convicts in Ireland, with some Remarks on the same in England, reviewed, 241.

Owen, R., his *Osteological Contributions to the Natural History of the Anthropoid Apes*, reviewed, 541.

P

Papers on Gold in British Columbia: on the Condition and Prospects of Goldfields in Victoria, reviewed, 82; on the Mutinies in the East Indies, reviewed, 444.

Pentateuch, Historic Character of the, vindicated, reviewed, 498.

Plessner, M. Salomon, his *Judisch Mosaischer Religionsunterricht für die Israelitische Jugend*, reviewed, 180.

Public Affairs, 269 — defence of the country, 273 — the Volunteers, 273 — iron-plated ships and fortification of naval arsenals, 274 — military establishments in the Colonies, 277 — financial condition, 279 — cotton manufacture, 279 — wealth of Lancashire and Cheshire, 283 — Parliamentary grant, 285 — foreign relations, 287 — the Northern Courts, 288 — France and England, 290 — Italy, 291 — Greece, 293 — Ionian Islands, 293 — American revolution, 295 — question of recognising the Seceded States, 296 — precedents, 299 — French propositions, 304.

Q

Quinet, M. E., his *Histoire de la Campagne de 1815*, reviewed, 147.

R

- Reports on Convict Prisons in England and Ireland, and on Transportation and Penal Servitude*, reviewed, 244.
Report as to the State of the Mining Districts, reviewed, 406.
Report of the Tithe Redemption Trust, and *Lands Report on the Deficiency of Means of Spiritual Instruction*, reviewed, 360.
Rubens, Contributions to the Life of, 116 — Brotherhood of St. Luke, 121 — early career of Rubens, 124 — his works, 127 — 'Descent from the Cross,' 129 — employed by Mary of Medicis, 131 — Mr. Sainsbury's edition of his letters, 133 — diplomatic acquaintance with England, 136 — the Infanta, 137 — visit to Madrid, 138 — mission to England, 138 — 'Crucifixion of St. Peter,' 143 — his etchings, 146.

S

- Sainsbury, W. N.*, his *Unpublished Papers*, illustrative of the Life of Sir Peter Paul Rubens, reviewed, 116.
Salvador, M. Joseph, his *Histoire des Institutions de Moïse et du Peuple hébreu; Jésus-Christ et sa Doctrine; Histoire de la Domination Romaine en Judée, et de la Ruine de Jérusalem*; and *Paris, Rome, Jerusalem, ou la Question Religieuse au XIX^e Siècle*, reviewed, 180.
Simancas Records of the Reign of Henry VII., 378 — Mr. Bergenroth's operations, 379 — Ferdinand and Isabella, 383 — the Inquisition, 383 — Commission to contract an alliance with Ferdinand and Isabella, 387 — De Puebla's mission, 387 — Treaty of 1489, 390 — treaty with Charles VIII. in 1493, 391 — marriage of Princess Katharine, 393 — instruction to the Duke of Estrada, 395 — treaty of marriage between Katharine and Henry Prince of Wales, 398 — question as to the dispensation, 399 — Juana of Castile, 404.

T

- Thiers, M. A.*, his *Histoire du Consulat et de l'Empire*, 147 — campaign of 1815, 147 — Charleroi, 152 — Ligny and Quatre Bras, 154 — Thiers and Siborne on Quatre Bras, 163 — Blucher's movements, 164 — Waterloo, 166.
Tithe Impropriation, 360 — 'Tithe Redemption Trust,' 360 — vicars and perpetual curates, 362 — Queen Anne's Bounty, 363 — evils of inappropriated tithes, 363 — extent to which tithes have been alienated, 369 — income of the Ecclesiastical Commission, 372 — holding of Church property by laymen, 375 — Sir H. Spelman's 'History of Tithes,' 375 — tithe-restoration, 377.

V

- Vance, Rev. W. F.*, his *Voice from the Mines*, reviewed, 406.

W

Webb, F. C., his *Treatise on Man and the Anthropoid Apes*, reviewed, 541.

Woodward, J. E., his *Geological Observations in South Australia*, reviewed, 82.

Wordsworth, Canon, his *Inspiration of the Bible*, reviewed, 498.

Worsley, P. S., his *Translation of Homer's Odyssey*, reviewed, 353.

LONDON

PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.

NEW-STREET SQUARE

